

+

+

OBSCURANTISM EXPOSED

BY

GEORGE P. STAVROPOULOS

ATHENS

2009

+

+

+

+

+

+

+

+

SELECTED
MOSTLY UNANSWERED
EARLIER CORRESPONDENCE

+

+

+

+

+

+

+

+

OBSCURANTISM EXPOSED

**SELECTED
MOSTLY UNANSWERED
EARLIER CORRESPONDENCE**

BY

GEORGE P. STAVROPOULOS

B. Sc., M. Sc., D.I.C., Ph. D.

ATHENS

2009

+

+

+

+

© 2009 by George P. Stavropoulos

ISBN: 978-960-92751-5-6

All rights reserved. No parts of this book may be copied or reproduced in any form by any means photographic, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, or recording, nor be translated in *any* other language, nor be set in any information storage and retrieval system, intending to obtain commercial gain for any third party without permission in writing from the Author.

Inquiries should be addressed to the Author at
45 Sporadon Street, Athens, 11361, Greece.

© 2009 by George P. Stavropoulos.

ISBN: 978-960-85044-7-9

The electronic resetting is intended for the exclusive publication in the Internet
solely for the free strictly personal information of its users.

Should the latter feel they owe something, let it be their favorite *true* charity.
Except for legitimate quotations for the purposes of analysis, criticism, research
and the advancement of knowledge, the above restrictions apply.

Electronic Public Edition, 2009

Stavropoulos, George P., 1934—

SELECTED MOSTLY UNANSWERED EARLIER CORRESPONDENCE

Internally consistent in depth Analysis of the present accepted Foundations of the
Religious-Scientific-Philosophical Conception and Theories
and their Effect on Our present Behavior.

Includes Index.

1. Logic. 2. Philosophy. 3. Reality. 4 Religion. 5. Science.

6. Effect on Behavior.

I. Title.

Text set principally in Times Size 10.

Printed in Greece.

+

+

+

+

To all those who, I *truly* wish, had *not* given me Cause!

+

+

+

+

+

+

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	13
1. Re: PROPOSAL TO THE ROYAL SOCIETY September 19, 1985.	19
2. Re: REQUEST FOR REVIEW October 22, 1985.	20
3. Re: REPLY FROM THE ROYAL SOCIETY October 3, 1985.	22
4. Re: DR. PENZIAS' RESPONSE October 28, 1985.	23
5. Re: PUBLICATION PROPOSAL November 7, 1985.	24
6. Re: REQUEST FOR REVIEW November 11, 1985.	27
7. Re: PROFESSOR PAULING'S RESPONSE November 20, 1985.	33
8. Re: FIRST RESPONSE TO PROFESSOR PAULING December 1, 1985.	34
9. Re: MR. TENNITY'S RESPONSE January 22, 1986.	36
10. Re: PROFESSOR PAULING'S RESPONSE February 3, 1986.	43
11. Re: REPLY TO MR. TENNITY'S RESPONSE February 3, 1986.	45
12. Re: QUESTIONS ON QUALITY OF SUBMISSIONS (Referred to in the previous article)	65
13. Re: SECOND RESPONSE TO PROFESSOR PAULING February 13, 1986.	69
14. Re: THE LAST LETTER TO MR. TENNITY March 10, 1986.	74
15. Re: FIRST LETTER TO DR. GAVALAS March 26, 1986.	81

16. Re: FIRST LETTER TO PROF. WIGNER June 29, 1986.	86
17. Re: SECOND LETTER TO PROF. WIGNER July 3, 1986.	88
18. Re: FIRST LETTER TO DR. ROMER December 11, 1986.	89
19. Re: EVOLUTION VS. CREATIONISM December 15, 1986.	90
20. Re: LETTER TO PROF. NEWTON January 8, 1987.	93
21. Re: SECOND LETTER TO DR. ROMER January 10, 1987.	96
22. Re: LETTER TO DR. POUNCEY February 2, 1987.	97
23. Re: LETTER TO DR. KOCH February 2, 1987.	100
24. Re: THE REPLY OF DR. KOCH February 13, 1987.	103
25. Re: SECOND LETTER TO DR. KOCH February 20, 1987.	104
26. Re: REQUESTING COMPETENT DISPROOF February 20, 1987.	110
27. Re: SECOND LETTER TO PROF. NEWTON February 20, 1987.	111
28. Re: THE REPLY OF PROF. NEWTON March 19, 1987.	112
29. Re: THE REPLY TO PROF. NEWTON March 25, 1987.	114
30. Re: ON THE RELATIVITY OF CLOCKS April 8, 1987.	122
31. Re: PRESS RELEASE/PUBLIC STATEMENT April 21, 1987.	135
32. Re: LETTER TO MR. COWEN May 6, 1987.	144
33. Re: FIRST LETTER TO DR. SAMIOS May 7, 1987.	146
34. Re: SECOND LETTER TO DR. SAMIOS May 29, 1987.	147

35. Re: REPLY FROM THE PHYSICAL REVIEW June 1, 1987.	149
36. Re: REQUESTING ASSISTANCE AGAINST RESISTANCE July 1, 1987.	150
37. Re: LETTER TO BISHOP ANAST. GIANNOULATOS July 7, 1987.	153
38. Re: MATTERS OF FACT October 9, 1987.	167
39. Re: LETTER TO BISHOP AUGUSTINE KANTIOTIS October 30, 1987.	168
40. Re: SECOND LETTER TO DR. PENZIAS February 4, 1988.	179
41. Re: LETTER TO PROFESSOR HARRISON February 11, 1988.	181
42. Re: PROF. HARRISON'S FIRST REPLY February 15, 1988.	184
43. Re: DR. HOHENBERG'S RESPONSE February 23, 1988.	185
44. Re: THE REPLY TO DR. HOHENBERG February 28, 1988.	186
45. Re: LETTER TO IMPERIAL COLLEGE March 26, 1988.	192
46. Re: LETTER TO WIFE May 20, 1988.	197
47. Re: THE RECTOR'S REPLY May 31, 1988.	203
48. Re: LETTER TO PROF. HAWKING June 24, 1988.	205
49. Re: RESPONDING TO PROF. HARRISON June 24, 1988.	207
50. Re: PROF. HARRISON'S SECOND REPLY September 15, 1988.	209
51. Re: SECOND LETTER TO DR. GAVALAS June 21, 1989.	212
52. Re: FIRST LETTER TO PROF. NYCHIS May 10, 1990.	220
53. Re: SECOND LETTER TO PROF. NYCHIS June 27, 1990.	233

54. Re: LETTER TO PROFESSOR WITTEN October 17, 1990.	234
55. Re: APPEALING THE TRIAL OF SOCRATES Circa end of 1990.	242
56. Re: THE STATE OF DEMOCRACY AND THE CITIZEN'S RESPONSIBILITY October 19, 1992.	250
57. Re: ΤΑΓΩΝ ΑΣΩΤΕΙΑ ΚΑΙ Η ΟΡΙΣΤΙΚΗ ΑΥΤΗΣ ΑΡΣΙΣ February 1, 1993.	255
58. Re: ΘΡΗΝΟΣ ΕΠΑΝΑΚΑΜΨΑΝΤΟΣ ΕΙΣ ΕΛΛΑΔΑ October 28, 1993.	257
59. Re: ΠΕΡΙ ΛΥΣΕΩΣ ΤΟΥ ΠΡΟΒΛΗΜΑΤΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΟΝΟΜΑΣΙΑΣ ΤΟΥ ΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΤΩΝ ΣΚΟΠΙΩΝ June 6, 1994.	264
60. Re: THE PRESENT-DAY DUTIES OF CHRISTIANS September 7, 1994.	266
61. Re: LETTER TO MR. ANT. KARKAGIANNES November 8, 1996.	278
62. Re: ΠΕΡΙ ΟΡΘΟΔΟΞΙΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΟΛΙΤΙΣΜΟΥ (Attached to the above)	280
63. Re: ΠΕΡΙ ΖΩΗΣ ΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΒΙΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΤΟΥΤΩΝ ΝΟΗΜΑΤΟΣ November 23, 1996.	288
64. Re: ΠΕΡΙ ΥΠΑΡΞΕΩΣ ΘΕΟΥ December 21-6, 1996.	293
65. Re: ΑΝΑΧΩΡΤΙΣΜΟΥ ΚΡΙΤΙΚΗ January 11, 1997.	307
66. Re: LETTER TO MRS. KITTY FERGUSON March 10, 1997.	314
67. Re: REPLY OF MRS. FERGUSON May 7, 1997.	371
68. Re: ΠΕΡΙ ΤΑ ΔΕΟΝΤΑ ΕΝ ΕΛΛΑΔΙ ΓΕΝΕΣΘΑΙ December 31, 1997.	372
69. Re: ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΣΙΣ ΑΡΧΙΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΙΚΗΣ ΔΡΑΣΕΩΣ May 21, 1998.	377
70. Re: LETTER TO DR. HARPER July 29, 1998.	390

71. Re: DR. HARPER'S REPLY September 19, 1998.	411
72. Re: PRESIDENTIAL INDISCRETIONS AND THEIR CONSEQUENCES December 28, 1998.	412
73. Re: LETTER TO DR. GEORGE BISTIS On Greeks and Jews in the World January 2, 1999.	416
74. Re: LETTER TO MR. ST. ZOULAS April 26, 1999.	420
75. Re: ΤΗΣ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑΣ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΩΣ ΟΡΩΜΕΝΗΣ (Attached to the above)	422
76. Re: LETTER TO MR. ST. ZOUMPOULAKES. February 19, 2000.	437
77. Re: ΕΠΙ ΤΗ ΔΙΣΧΛΙΕΤΗΡΙΔΙ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑΣ ΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΔΟΞΑΣΙΩΝ ΤΙΝΩΝ ΒΡΑΧΕΙΑ ΚΡΙΤΙΚΗ ΑΠΟΤΙΜΗΣΙΣ (Attached to the above)	438
78. Re: ΦΙΛΙΑ ΔΙΚΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΥ ΠΑΡΕΜΒΑΣΙΣ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΑΣ ΣΧΕΣΕΙΣ ΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΚΑΙ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣ June 19, 2000.	448
79. Re: LETTER TO DR. GEORGE BISTIS On Pessimism and Objective Reality September 19, 2000.	475
80. Re: ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΗ ΚΑΙ ΟΡΘΟΔΟΞΙΑ November 3, 2000	479
81. Re: ΕΠΙ ΤΟΥ ΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΤΙΚΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΘΕΜΑΤΩΝ ΕΘΝΙΚΟΥ ΕΝΔΙΑΦΕΡΟΝΤΟΣ May 28, 2001.	509
82. Re: LETTER TO DR. GEORGE BISTIS The Clash and Reconciliation of Civilizations in the Globalized World October 10, 2001.	515
83. Re: LETTER TO AMBASSADOR MILLER April 3, 2003.	552
84. Re: LETTER TO PROF. SARRES October 19, 2003.	556
85. Re: LETTER TO DR. GEORGE BISTIS On the present state of Science December 20/21, 2004.	560

86. Re: LETTER TO DR. GEORGE BISTIS A second look at the present state of Science May 12/17, 2005.	566
87. Re: ΟΛΟΚΛΗΡΩΜΑΤΙΚΗ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΙΚΗ ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΙΑ ΚΑΙ ΤΟ ΔΕΟΝ ΓΕΝΕΣΘΑΙ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟ ΠΕΡΙΒΑΛΛΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ ΑΕΙΦΟΡΙΑΝ April 30, 2007.	571
88. Re: ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟ ΠΛΑΝΗΤΙΚΟΝ ΠΡΟΒΛΗΜΑ ΕΝΕΡΓΕΙΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΘΕΡΜΟΚΡΑΣΙΑΣ January 28, 2008.	573
89. Re: Η ΤΩΝ ΓΛΥΠΤΩΝ ΜΑΡΜΑΡΩΝ ΠΑΡΑ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΔΙΗΚΟΥΣΑ ΒΑΡΒΑΡΟΣ ΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΒΛΑΣΦΗΜΟΣ ΣΥΛΗΞΙΣ June 26, 2009.	575
INDEX	585

OBSCURANTISM EXPOSED

SELECTED MOSTLY UNANSWERED EARLIER CORRESPONDENCE

INTRODUCTION

I *truly* wish, *none* had given me Cause! *Not* that I hungered for immediate recognition! But that I hungered for the condition that *both* “*scientists*” and “*theologians*”, namely people respectively advertising themselves as people of Reason and people of God, had had the *manly* courage to confess that *there had been binding* aspects of *both Reason and TheoLogy* that they had *not* considered, as they ought to have done *before* those aspects were thrown to their face. Unavoidably, the impact *had* to be proportional to the delay of recognizing those long-before-overlooked aspects. He who would find those aspects *had* an obligation to test them himself to the end of his own ability for correctness; then he *had* an obligation to ask others to consider his findings, check them out themselves to the end of their abilities for correctness; and in case they could find no fault with them recommend their immediate public recognition as highly overdue!

In the case that I happen to support, this did *not* happen! Between Plato who taught in still extant language the correct way of reasoning and the modern era, there came upon us the Dark Ages, during which we lost both our orientation and our unique general compass! We were “reborn”, but we did *not* throw out of our minds the Dark Ages, that taught us that *damned* “*somehow*”, the *common* shield of both “theologians” and “scientists”!

That God made the world “*somehow*” is the still current “theological” be-

lief! The “theologians” do *not* regard it as a *necessary* part of TheoLogy to investigate *how* God created the world *in order to attain the specific Purpose He set out to attain by means of the world!* They indeed go further: they *profane* God by stating that His existence cannot be proven! But if so, *neither* can the *exact* body His Will be proven; and as a result, *anyone* may install *one’s own* “God” and tell the rest of us that “this”, namely *his* own, is the “Will” of what *he* installs as “God”! When the “theologians” are told that the world *is in the present mess exactly as a result of this their own teaching*, they go in hiding! It is simply beyond their ken that by this reasoning of theirs, they let *relativity* into “theology”; and as a result, *all* gods, including the Real One *and* all those imagined, are seen as “co-equal”! The moral dissolution of the world, due to the general belief that all its “aspects”, as all nowadays feel free to present and “argue”(!) for, are to be respected equally, is a *direct* by-product of this sort of “theology”, by means of which the priests of *all* beliefs, as a *guild of guilds*, secure or attempt to secure for themselves equal respect by all and demand free passports to go everywhere in order to demolish the age-old morals by “globalizing” the world! A carefully cultivated benign-looking façade is the sine qua non by which no one may be displeased with them! Given that “somehow”, here do we have the results!

When “science” broke away from “theology”, the “scientists” began believing that the world came into being “*somehow*”, *yet without the intervention of God!* So inevitably, “science” is split between the belief that the world has always been (and thus needs no cause of its own); and the belief that it came into being suddenly, out of nothing at all, without prior cause, at the moment of what we call the Big Bang, a moment that “science” believes has (sort of) approached to within a fraction of a second in the *definite* past that marked the beginning of the world! Whereas the second belief *consciously yet inexplicably* ignores the principle “*nihil ex nihilo*”, the first belief, at first sight, bypasses this principle without the need for an apology, yet, at second sight, *overlooks* the obvious hard fact that within the “world that has always been” we do indeed find that *we constantly demand and seek causes* for whatever physical happens within that world!: [Here is an example: If your wallet vanishes from your breast pocket and is found in mine, you would *not* believe that this happened without a cause! Instead, you would believe that I stole it, and you would call the police and demand that I be dragged to the courts! Now reverse the subjects: Would *you*, a “scientist”, present to the court the “defense” that a “black hole” “*somehow*” removed it from my pocket and deposited in yours, without you knowing anything about it? Would you sanely demand that in the name of “science” the judge does have no option but to declare you innocent?] There is more: Under both beliefs, “scientists” believe that the world has no reason for being! Yet, we *all* demand reasons, and principally *they* want us to believe that *they* serve Reason! An un-

reasoning Universe, after untold belly aching, created us and through us Reason! And moreover, an unreasoning Universe based on indeterminacy, brought forth determinacy and through it us, so very determined in all we say and do! A very hard to swallow fairy tale indeed! Made even harder when you think that the “scientists” are in the pay of people demanding means and inventions intended to have a *limited* lifespan so that we never stop inventing and producing, so that we make ever more money that must be spent in ever more *discovered* “needs” to no end other than *both* devaluing the money we think we thus make [a “reasonable” rate of inflation is good for us the financial gurus teach us!] *and* in the process exhausting the capability of the planet to support our insatiability. Under this sort of “Reason” that “scientists” obey and serve, they cannot but return to the belief that all is for nought, that there is no ultimate Reason, other than pointless existence, for the sake of which we even seek ways to escape from this planet [another way to spend other people’s money so that “scientists” have something to be occupied with *and* be well paid for it!—the latest search: looking for water in the Moon, the atmospheric pressure of which is somewhere around 10^{-15} atm., that ought to have triggered the question of the temperature under which water ice would saturate that atmosphere and a comparison with the observed temperature on the Moon, it being obvious *both* that a higher than that temperature would result in the evaporation and subsequent loss of water vapor given the Moon’s gravitational field *and* the need to supply heat to melt so deep-frozen water, should it be found, before it can be used! In other words, “scientists” after they shall have done their utmost to destroy the Earth, already *are* at work preparing the way for destroying the Moon as a first step to destroying the world beyond! This is called “scientific reasoning”!] With these in mind I submit that, no *scientist*, telling others that he serves Reason through this sort of “science”, ought to be satisfied with himself believing in the veracity of that sort of “science”! This way of going from “somehow” to “somehow” *most definitely is not* Science! Science is *not* a material *nor* a moneymaking enterprise, it is Γνῶσις leading to Wisdom that is so obviously lacking!

I will *not* say that back in 1974, when I started on this sort of intellectual adventure that today pushes me to write this introduction to the following mostly unanswered correspondence with the sort of “theologians” and “scientists” I just described, I had all this in mind. What I had in mind was the Platonic ideal: that *all* ultimately do make Sense. *Not* each its own, but *one unified* Sense! The dimensional analysis I applied to Newton’s law of gravitation, that *no one had done before*, was the key to all that I *in spare time* between 1974 and 1984 did that culminated in finishing, within 1985, writing the “*Principia Physica Universi*”, the first of this series of eight books that is now being completed with this one.

The first book was not at all well received: Seeking to make Sense of it

all made me *enemies of them all*! The Athenians poisoned Socrates! The Sicilians sold Plato as a slave! I, so far, was lucky, being only ignored! Some centuries back, I *would* have been burned! People in power, both in “science” and “theology” most definitely do *not* like making Sense of it *all*, because this is the way of *uniting into one* Science and TheoLogy, that *cuts us all* to size! *Including primarily* those in power!

The weaknesses of both presently accepted theories were most briefly mentioned above. The dimensional analysis of Newton’s law of gravitation revealed that out of a total of eight ways under each of which the Universe could possibly have been built, the seven of them *must* be rejected either for hiding internal logical antinomies, or for disagreeing with dependable astronomical observations or for both; leaving standing the option of the Universe being constructed on *absolutely constant* G and M and the *variable* T, being respectively the gravitational constant, the total mass in the Universe and its *obviously variable finite* age! *All* universal development stands on these three pillars that include the *thus begun* flow of time, *all tied together under Law since the beginning*. This not only removes the standing theories along with all their weaknesses, “somehows” and Logical non sequiturs, but it also reveals that behind the Law so operating, there *inescapably stands its Lawgiver*! It is *His constant Presence*, revealed by the faithful exact operation of the Law, that *unites into one* Science and TheoLogy, and *cuts us all* to size! *Including primarily* those in power! Because, Law and Lawgiver show that operating in Him is not just a “Mind” that minds *everything*, but a *complete* Λόγος and a *complete* Reason (in *all His* senses!), united necessarily in a *single* Person, standing apart in a category (in B. Russell’s sense) exclusively of His own, a category of *being having just one member*, Him! *That* is why people on both sides, those of “science” and “theology”, *without the daring to confess it*, have acted and continue to act as here in this book is being revealed! If he is sufficiently brave and intellectually disciplined, the objective reader will assess the Situation for himself.

My efforts were, of course, much wider than shown in this book. This is only a selection from my effort, that extended to writing to many more others, always with the same result: their disinclination and disinterest to consider reviewing or publishing the book, or their total silence! They simply would not even admit that they could not accept the possibility that “science” could have missed something so basic that would bring down their entire house of cards! My pleading that they produce disproof of my findings was *never* answered, let alone satisfied. What response I got is here sufficiently told. The most eminent people in “science” and “theology” were written to; only some are here mentioned. I shall not put them all to the same basket. One of them is clearly seen as a close personal and family friend. After we moved here to Athens, he was sending me material and I responded being thus triggered. The presentation is in

strict calender order: in order that it better expose what was going on through time, as well as give some idea of how I contacted people, having in my mind both what answers and non-answers I had in the meantime received.

The material included is both in English and Greek. Only some I thought it best to translate into English in order to include them here. In others, I thought it best to leave the Greek phrases untranslated, in order not to brake the flow of thought expressed by giving the translation in brackets. The Greek I used is not that spoken today. I kept the grammar and syntax of the ancient Greek. Of course, the meaning of terms not then known had to be “ancientized” from the present terms. Those able to read and understand ancient Greek shall have no difficulty getting to all the juice as it came to me and was sent on.

I am of the considered opinion that I have indeed bridged Science and TheoLogY. The capitals in these words are *not* mistypings. They convey the awe that I think it proper to convey when we use the words. Here, in all this series of books, we dare trend *in* the Burning Bush, as it were, in order that we better sense what is truly united by the sheer force of their essential identity. Those choosing not to enter are all the more poorer for *their* choice. They only have themselves to blame. Those that since 1985 obstructed the effort to make the findings known have the added weight on their necks of the untold rivers of blood shed since and the untold catastrophe brought since on cities, countries, nations, civilizations built at the expense of untold more blood and holy human sweat both bodily and mental over thousands of years. This World was *not* made for the pleasure of some at the expense of others. It was made for a *Higher Purpose*, and *that* is that *has* been delayed. The obstructionists *must* prepare their personal ApoLogY. The time of profanities is at its close. The rest *must* be silence: The Judge *is* now sitting!

Athens, October 18-19, 2009.

N.B. The heads of letters received are not images of the original ones, but the best possible approximations to them this author’s computer could produce given the limitations of this book’s page size. The texts of the letters received are the exact original ones, yet here set in the Times and Graeca fonts.

1

Re: PROPOSAL TO THE ROYAL SOCIETY

The Secretary General of
THE ROYAL SOCIETY,
6 Carlton House Terrace,
London, SW1Y 5AG

September 19, 1985.

Dear Sir,

May I request that you kindly invest the time to study and then perhaps forward the Book Publication Proposal attached hereto? It refers to a manuscript already completed and ready for submission, which represents a major development in scientific thought in an area of the greatest importance.

Given the position of the Royal Society in the scientific world, I trust you will be most anxious to consider the publication of my book. In view of the illustrious contribution of British Science and my own fond and proud association with it, I would be honored indeed if my book was published in Great Britain. It so happens that we are just about to celebrate the 300th anniversary of Newton's "Principia". I do very much hope that my own present contribution will not be viewed as impertinent.

May I also, please, draw your particular attention to a number of considerations discussed on Page 4 of the Proposal? Your resident experts and scholars are indeed in position to advise you on the relationship of these considerations to the importance of the project.

Your speedy reply will be appreciated very deeply, since a number of important personal and professional matters hinge on it.

Very sincerely yours,

2

Re: REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Dr. Arno Penzias, V.P.,
BELL LABORATORIES,
600 Mountain Ave.,
Murray Hill, NJ 07974

October 22, 1985.

Dear Dr. Penzias,

Back in 1974, I was reading R. Besançon's *Encyclopedia of Physics* when I came upon a theoretical realization and discovery of great importance. During the fateful first twenty minutes or so, I was in possession of a few relationships, the most striking of which was the Law of Variation of the Velocity of Light! Using that Law in reverse, I was able to obtain the value of the total mass in the Universe, in close agreement with the best astronomical determinations! Associated and logically fully consistent with this Law were the Laws of average and local densities of matter in the Universe! It was immediately obvious to me that variation in the velocity of light destroys the principle of conservation of energy, that cornerstone of modern science, and so, logically, that the Universe tells a story at odds with the "experience" that we have incorporated into the first law of thermodynamics!

My subsequent exhaustive analysis permitted me to obtain, in an extraordinarily simple manner, mostly quantitative relationships resolving the mystery of a large number of questions that have perplexed scientists and cosmologists so far. The scope and universality of the new conception includes even the *intrinsic variation* of the so-called "standard" length and time interval, which no theory has so far considered. Thus, in effect, my study showed that contrary to our "experience", there indeed exists a universal law that alone makes the Universe fully logical! It also showed that when that law is subjected to analysis, it leads *naturally* to discrimination of the *actuality* from all other possibilities logically open under that law.

This led me to question the principles at the foundations of that other great modern theory: quantum mechanics. My studies in that area permitted me to develop a new model of the electron, which avoids all the shortcomings of the Bohr model (only "pictorial" model we have) and explains not only the spectra of hydrogen-like atoms but also the spectrum of the helium atom. (Subsequent early calculations show that it also explains at least the basic spectral series of the two-electron lithium atom and possibly also of the three-electron lithium

atom). Equally important is the fact that *the model is able to give data on the electron and to distinguish fully between the two electrons in the helium atom!* If the model can indeed be extended to other atoms, then logically, it will follow that all electrons in all atoms are distinguishable from each other! The model also shows that the spectrum arises from energy transitions in which all electrons in the atom, and not only the outermost one, are involved. Thus, it appears safe to state that a physical (as opposed to the current probabilistic) quantum theory which avoids the philosophical difficulties of the principle of indeterminacy is indeed possible. If so, the logicity of the Universe is complete, which permits one to proceed to study the significance of the Law itself. My findings in this area throw a totally new light upon Reality.

All these researches of mine were conducted *in spare time* since 1974. Since January 1985, I was able to devote full time to this project and on Sept. 1, I typed the last page of an obviously unique, *sui generis* book of previously unpublished material running to vii+377 pages, consisting of about 137500 words (including the space of more than 290 equations), 8 Figures and 10 Tables. A copy of the Table of Contents is appended hereto. I have entitled the book "PRINCIPIA PHYSICA UNIVERSI". In view of its scope and content, it appeared that no other title would quite do it justice.

On Sept. 12, after rechecking the manuscript, I sent my first queries to a number of publishers. Those who so far have answered, under one excuse or another declined to accept the manuscript *even* for examination! Doubtless, they must have disbelieved that a metallurgist could possibly have come up with valid answers to such momentous questions! If so, it is logical to expect that their hesitation will vanish if my work has the endorsement of a few world-renowned authorities in both areas of study. I have requested others to help me locate such people, but so far I have had no response. I even called the National Academy of Sciences to ask for a list of Nobel laureates, their activities and addresses and I was astounded to hear that they do not keep such a list! Additionally, the review process being what it is, some publishers seemed unwilling to guarantee or at least safeguard the patronymity of the contents of my book until its actual appearance in print, which I requested, given the importance of the project. To help ease this problem, I have since applied for copyright.

Dr. Penzias, you and Dr. Wilson are the only laureates whose addresses I was so far able to obtain. I would be truly honored as well as indebted if you could find the time to read my manuscript in its entirety and offered me your opinion of it. If you would be unable to do so, could you possibly suggest some other fellow-laureates whom I might be able to approach? I am sending a similar letter to Dr. Wilson.

Very sincerely,

3

Re: REPLY FROM THE ROYAL SOCIETY

The Royal Society
6 Carlton House Terrace, London, SW1Y 5AG

3 October 1985

Our ref: Ed/MBG/FMH

Dear Dr. Stavropoulos,

Thank you for your letter of 19 September 1985 addressed to the Secretary General.

I am sorry to say that the Society does not publish as books unsolicited typescripts. The only books it publishes are annual volumes such as the *Year Book*, and those that arise from the reports of Discussion Meetings, from the reports of Study Groups and similar bodies, or – more rarely – from special anniversaries or occasions at the request of the Council of the Society. The only unsolicited material published by the Society is that submitted through Fellows or Foreign Members for publication in *Proceedings* or *Philosophical Transactions*; this material then undergoes academic refereeing and, if accepted, appears in due course in one of the journals.

On the face of it, what you are offering does not fit this category – it is too long as a journal paper – and is in any case on a subject that is outside the journals' coverage.

It is not the policy of the Society to offer opinions on articles unless they have been submitted for publication in the journals.

I am sorry that I cannot be of more help to you, although I appreciate the significance of the 300th anniversary of Newton's *Principia* and am grateful that you considered the Society as a potential publisher of your work on such an auspicious occasion.

Yours sincerely

Dr. M.B. Goatly
Assistant Editor

AUTHOR'S COMMENT: Unless I was out of this planet, I noticed no auspicious world-wide celebration of the *pivotal for science appearance* of Newton's *Principia* on its 300th anniversary!

4

Re: DR. PENZIAS' RESPONSE

AT&T

Bell Laboratories

Arno Penzias
Vice President
Research

Room 6A-411
600 Mountain Avenue
Murray Hill NJ 07974
Phone (201) 582-3361

October 28, 1985

Dear Dr. Stavropoulos:

Like many other people you have put together a theory which calls for a temporal variation of the speed of light. There's an ample body of work on this subject which you are probably not aware of. I suggest you contact Professor I. E. Segal at MIT, 77 Massachusetts Ave., Cambridge, Mass. 02139, who is probably the leading worker in this discipline. The tests of time varying constants are much more exacting than you apparently seem to think. I therefore suggest you contact him before you proceed further.

Let me also caution you that a great deal is known about helium of which you are apparently unaware, such as, the solid phases of liquid He^3 at very low (less than .001°K) temperatures. While physics books usually give accounts of accepted theories, there is no room for all the less interesting ones that have been tried. Unfortunately this leads people to reinvent things which have been tried and found wanting.

I hope these comments have been helpful to you.

(Signature)

5

Re: PUBLICATION PROPOSAL

Mr. Kenneth Tennity,
Science Editor,
Prentice-Hall, Inc.,
643A Tremont St.,
P.O.Box 5,
Boston, MA 02118

November 7, 1985.

Dear Mr. Tennity,

This is the publication proposal of which we spoke earlier today:

Modern science is based upon the concepts of relativity and quantum mechanics. Basic in the former is the notion of constancy of the velocity of light. Basic in the latter is the notion of quantum as used in the principle of indeterminacy. In our efforts to understand the hows and whys of physical reality, whether in the small or the very large scale, these two notions are brought together with other basic assumptions, such as the principles of conservation of mass and energy, the constancy or variability of G, the cosmological or perfect cosmological principle, etc. It is obvious that ultimate simplicity can only obtain if the entire Universe is consistently "built" upon the fewest possible principles. However, the principles and assumptions brought together in building a, any, particular world model have not been shown as a group to be free of internal contradiction, nor are our laws of physics, as we understand them to apply locally, themselves free of essentially unevaluated (as regards their universal significance) underlying assumptions. Thus the task of showing internal consistency and of separating human contingency from the objective Law of Nature is a very difficult one and it cannot be said to have been faced and resolved in any of the theories, including relativity and quantum mechanics, or in any of the world models proposed so far.

Most of the models of the Universe already worked out are based on (the field equations of) general relativity. Efforts are first being made to establish a model that can be expressed in "generally covariant form". Only later does one seek to simplify the problem by transforming to a reference system in which the equations are formally simple and their solution testable. However, given the immense complexity of the problem of the Universe and all it contains, nobody knows how to write the complete set of generally covariant equations. If the so-

lution of the problem of the Universe, according to the just described procedure, is to appear formally simple in a particular frame, and it is such a solution that will finally be accepted because only such a solution can be tested at all, does it really matter if we arrive there after the solution has already been shown to conform to general covariance? Perhaps, it will be much more economical of effort to obtain a particularly simple and testable picture of the Universe first and only then seek to determine whether it conforms to the principle of general covariance, or whether the latter is at all needed. Such a picture has now been obtained:

Eleven years ago, starting from the very simple principle that the Universe is indeed both intelligible and maximally economical in its means, I was able to obtain some early extremely simple and logically fully consistent expressions free of human contingency. The predictions made possible under this scheme were possible to check out against what is known or believed to be reasonably well known about the Universe and the basic processes in it. Only one set of conditions (requiring however abolition of the principle of constancy of the velocity of light) was found to be consistent both internally and with the external evidence. The method adopted, the complete examination allowed and the conclusions thus reached are totally unlike any other ones so far propounded and they permit definite and in principle testable statements to be made regarding a very large number of questions perplexing scientists, cosmologists and indeed philosophers.

Consistent with the above findings was a new physical model of the electron that explains not only the optical spectra of hydrogen and hydrogen-like atoms, but also that of the neutral helium atom. In addition, the model gives data on the electron and distinguishes fully between the two electrons in the helium atom. It also explains at least the basic spectral series of the two-electron lithium atom and possibly also of the three-electron lithium atom. If the model can be shown to apply to all atoms, it is obvious that the electrons in all atoms are distinguishable from each other, which of course is contrary to the uncertainty principle. However, a re-interpretation of the Heisenberg relationship is indeed possible. Moreover, definite conclusions consistent with the earlier findings and testable in principle may be drawn on the basis of the Planck-Einstein relationship regarding the truly fundamental particles which compose all bodies.

The principles upon which this work was carried out, its findings and an analysis of the basic Laws of Nature and their significance that is thus made possible constitute the contents of a book entitled "PRINCIPIA PHYSICA UNIVERSI" the manuscript (running to vii+377 pages and about 137500 words, including more than 290 equations) of which I now have completed writing and have ready for submission. A copy of the Table of Contents is appended hereto.

The book has been written at a level accessible to all who have had a col-

lege degree in the physical sciences and engineering and is intended for the very wide readership of practicing physicists, mathematicians, other scientists, engineers, philosophers and historians of science, as well as students who are interested in the logical, physical and philosophical resolution of the problem of physical reality.

As the author, I would naturally prefer to retain if possible the copyright of the book, and to that end, I have already applied to the Library of Congress. Is retention of copyright acceptable to you, or do you perhaps have a non-negotiable policy of only publishing books of which you own the copyright? In the latter case, do you condition submission of the manuscript on the author's tacit or explicit acceptance of eventual transfer of copyright? Or do you perhaps leave this matter for later, after you have had an opportunity fully to evaluate the book?

Your early reply and permission to submit the manuscript will be greatly appreciated.

Very sincerely,

6

Re: REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Professor Linus C. Pauling,
L. Pauling Institute of Science & Medicine,
440 Page Mill Rd., Palo Alto, CA 94306

November 11, 1985.

Dear Professor Pauling,

I am sorry to bother you and add to the load that you continue to place upon yourself, when others of a similar age have long since given up. Your continuing battles against wrongly established preconceptions, biases, half-truths or worse and the closed-mindedness of the “experts” have always been an inspiration to us of younger generations. I fervently wish you stay in good health for very many more years and continue to battle the forces of darkness that surround us all. You are probably the sole living true scientist who has consistently refused to accept the validity of artificial partitions in knowledge and taken on the “experts” on their own turf. The world is still very much in need of your continued example.

Lately, I have had an opportunity to taste first-hand and appreciate even more the loneliness of the path you have chosen. But I am far more powerless in my efforts to persuade others to pay attention to Logic. I have applied to a significant number of individuals, mostly science editors in leading university presses but also scientists including five Nobel laureates in physics, requesting them to please examine a most important manuscript that I have written, but they all have declined my offer. I seem to have committed the seemingly unpardonable sin of challenging received opinion in the area of the foundations of modern science, which “obviously” lies outside my own field of “professional expertise”!

Eleven years ago, then at the age of 40, I embarked on the ambitious project of writing a book on “Faith and Reason”, the object being to show that they are perfectly compatible with each other. I soon discovered that I needed to bring to bear “hard” arguments from the “exact” sciences. It was then that I came upon a realization that had escaped others. I was led to it by way of the minor realization that our theories about physical reality are based partly on physical evidence and partly on a multitude of seemingly “independent” assumptions, the validity of which has never been subjected to a critical examination as regards their internal consistency when taken as a complete set. What was and is worse, I real-

ized that we have placed a far greater (and, as in time I was able to show, unwarranted) weight upon our own preconceptions, biases, philosophical principles and pure assumptions rather than upon the hard facts of Nature. The “experts”, I had to conclude, have used the former to “shed light” on the latter, which is the exact opposite of what Reason suggests. Because, when confronted with Nature, Man, I thought, should assume the position of the humble student ready to absorb her lessons and should not presume to subjugate her to his own biases, as the “experts” have been doing.

In my efforts, I began from the very simple principle (in truth, a working hypothesis) that physical Nature, the entire Universe, is fully intelligible, for only then has science any philosophical justification at all. I made the additional working hypothesis that the Universe is maximally economical in its principles and means. I thought that if I could make any progress at all starting from such principles, there would be no doubt that that intelligibility and maximum economy could not possibly be there by pure blind chance, the odds against it being so unthinkable in magnitude. Reason suggested then that success in making progress had to lead to the conclusion that the Universe could only be intelligible if it was the product of Intelligence and could only be maximally economical if it was the product of Wisdom, in short, Creation of God. I then thought it impertinent that I, a mere human, should place limits upon God. This, I translated to mean that what God did He did for His own good reasons but in no case would He do anything less than perfect; and this perfection had to be akin not only to intelligibility and economy but also to simplicity and to the utter absence of confusion and uncertainty.

I was thus led to look at the hard evidence from a perspective diametrically opposite to that of the “experts” who have sought in recent centuries to understand the Universe while studiously avoiding this whole issue of intelligibility, economy, Intelligence, Wisdom, God, simplicity, clarity, certainty. I was soon rewarded with a discovery that permitted me to put it all (or almost) together, while totally avoiding the confusion created by the arbitrary introduction of human bias. In physical terms, this was possible through the potential existence in Nature of a Law opening the way to critical examination of a limited number of possibilities. I realized that if that law actually existed, of all possibilities, only one could actually be realized in Nature and it alone would shine through this critical examination. If I were successful in this effort, I thought, I would have proven the actual existence of that Law and would be able to explain as large a number of physical facts as they hinge from it, explain them in a manner totally free from all human hypotheses.

In my letters to the editors and scientists, I did not mention the above details of approach but only the problems of consistency and contingency and explained to them that there really exists a simple, safe, unique and heretofore un-

explored way to avoid them both, which, however, requires the variability of the velocity of light but it indeed leads to a novel yet fully logical resolution of a large number of questions perplexing scientists, cosmologists, philosophers. I further explained to them that consistent with these findings is a new physical model of the electron which explains not only the spectra of hydrogen and hydrogen-like atoms, as “does”(?) the Bohr model, but also the spectrum of the helium atom and at least the basic spectral series of the two-electron lithium atom and possibly also of the three electron lithium atom, which is beyond the abilities of the Bohr model. I also explained to them that equally important is the fact that the new model gives data on the electron and fully distinguishes between the electrons in the atom thus fully avoiding in this respect also the shortcomings of the Bohr model and of the current probabilistic quantum theory. It is obvious that if the model can be extended to all atoms, the uncertainty principle does not in fact apply in Nature, contrary to current opinion. I thought that reporting these two findings alone and my offering to send my manuscript would be sufficient to induce all recipients to want to see my manuscript in its entirety. Yet, nobody has offered to do so! Moreover, out of the five Nobel laureates, three did not even bother to acknowledge receipt of my letter in more than two weeks already.

One or two of those who responded suggested that I break up my manuscript, which they did not even offer to see, and send a number of articles to refereed journals. This I do not want to do because in my manuscript, I did not stop merely at the scientific findings. Rather, I proceeded to examine the significance and implications of the Natural Law(s) discovered, which quickly leads from physics to metaphysics. In fact, I found, it would be cowardly of me to stop at the physics, thus leaving my work only partly done. Thus, there is a very great deal more in my manuscript than constitutes the ordinary journal article. For this reason, I have not yet given up hope of persuading someone of great repute to read my manuscript as a whole and recommend that it be published as is (being truly scientific, as I believe it is) rather than in pieces. If the Universe was not built in a haphazard manner, the principles upon which it was built and their far-reaching implications must of necessity be presented in a comprehensive and well organized manner, which is possible only in book form. Nothing less would do them justice, one is compelled to conclude. In fact, it may well have been due also to the absence of a thorough, exhaustive and comprehensive examination of this entire problem and to the splintering of thought into scattered journal articles that has so far prevented resolution of the problem of the Universe.

In view of the resistance of the early respondents and the fast developing pattern, I sought legal advice and was told to apply for copyright, which I have since done.

I have entitled the manuscript “PRINCIPIA PHYSICA UNIVERSI”. It runs

to vii+377 [so it then stood!] pages, about 137500 words and it contains more than 290 equations. It has been the product of pure love and personal sacrifice, for not only have I devoted to this project all my spare time since 1974, not only did I not seek professional advancement that would interfere with what free time I had, but also because during the last twelve months, finding myself out of work given the circumstances in the metals industry, I gave this project absolute priority even at the cost of securing new employment.

Dear Professor Pauling, I hope I have not tired you, I hope you will forgive my boldness in addressing you, I hope you will not find it impertinent of me to ask of your precious time to read my manuscript. I am certain you recognize the importance of my findings for Science and for Truth, if they are true as I believe them to be. I will be honored if you agree to read my manuscript and I will cherish your comments on it. I remain,

Very respectfully,

P.S. To persuade you that my manuscript truly deserves to be read and to satisfy your natural curiosity as to how it all began in terms of physics, permit me to say this much more, totally skipping a fuller discussion of points of detail:

I figured that simplicity and universality of the Law of Nature demanded that I look closely at a (known) law of universal applicability, namely, at none other than Newton's Law of Gravitation, which even Einstein admired for its unsurpassed simplicity. Looking at that Law I immediately saw that the physical dimensions of G are $(\text{Density})^{-1} \times (\text{Time})^{-2}$. This much, I found later, was already known for a long time. Yet, my advance was possible at this very point by arguing that if G be a fundamental property of the Universe as a whole, then, logically, necessarily, inexorably, there exists a relationship of the form $G = \alpha(DT^2)^{-1}$, where the quantities on the right are also quantities of the entire Universe, namely, respectively, its *average* density and its *age*, α being a mere numerical constant. If so, then $D = M/V$ is none other than the ratio of the mass and volume of the entire Universe. The possibilities open to examination relate precisely to the constancy or variability of the five universal quantities G , D , T , M and V within the context of the two relationships already mentioned. For a spherical Universe, $V = (4/3)\pi R^3$ and for constant G and M (the only possibility the detailed analysis showed actually to be realized in Nature) one has $R = [(4\alpha\pi/3)^{-1} \times GMT^2]^{1/3}$. This shows that under Newtonian gravitation and if G is a true property of the entire Universe, the Universe necessarily expands in proportion to $T^{2/3}$!!! I did *not* constrain the Universe with the human bias of confusing its volume, which alone the above reasoning demands, with the notion of abstract space that theoreticians are so much preoccupied with. Thus, I did *not* hesitate to write $dR/dT = c$ and $d^2R/dT^2 = -GM/R^2$! Together, these lead to $\alpha = (6\pi)^{-1}$, $R = (9GMT^2/2)^{1/3}$; $c = (4GMT^{-1/3})^{1/3}$! The last one, for $T = 12$ billion years, gives $M = 1.15 \times 10^{56}$

grams!!! The solution $6\pi Gd \cdot t^2 = 1$ has indeed been found through the general relativistic route: It is the Einstein-deSitter solution for a universe devoid of mass! The theoreticians have not appreciated the significance of G as a fundamental property of the Universe! And so, they have not realized that $6\pi GDT^2 = 1$ (giving $D = 5.45 \times 10^{-30} \text{ g/cm}^3$) applies to the *entire* Universe and is demanded by Newton's Law, which thus is tied to universal expansion and leads directly to the variability of the velocity of light, and thus proves, through the numerical values obtained being in excellent agreement with observation, the physical validity of these *thus shown to be* Natural Laws!

The precession of Mercury is alleged to be evidence of the "breakdown" of Newton's Law. But is there a breakdown? In the first place, the effect of universal expansion upon planetary motions has totally been ignored. In the second place, the Law has been considered to apply with the separation r (in $F = Gm_1m_2/r^2$) assumed to be measured along a Euclidean straight line. Thus, actual astronomical measurements are compared to the theoretical expectation for a non-expanding two-body universe. A Euclidean straight-line separation is only perhaps another human bias that is not at all necessarily obeyed in a multi-body Universe. In a three-body universe, (Mercury-Sun-Jupiter), if Mercury were stopped on its course, it would fall towards the Sun *not* along a Euclidean straight line but along the curved side mS of the triangle mSJ (where m would be the position, now emptied, of Mercury at the moment at which the fall began) the three angles of which thus necessarily add up to *less* than 2π . In other words, an unconfused Universe requires an independent, additional and explicit Law to determine how the separation entering Newton's Law is to be measured. I can hardly think of a simpler way to introduce the Mach principle to all phenomena than by letting the entire Universe decide how any two bodies (in this case Mercury and Sun) are to attract each other by determining the path along which their instantaneous separation is to be measured. As scientists, we first must recognize the absolute logical necessity for such an additional Law that alone can determine how Newton's Law is to be applied. The actual solution of the problem will undoubtedly be quite involved when all effects (including universal expansion and the Sun's oblateness) are properly included. But it does *not* for a moment appear to be capable of vitiating the unsurpassed simplicity of Newton's Law. Rather, it complements that simplicity and sets it squarely at the center of the problem of gravitation in this very real Universe of ours, in sharp juxtaposition to the Einstein approach which derives Newton's Law from consideration of the field equations of gravitation in the total absence of matter and thus declares Newton's Law to be strictly applicable only in the non-physical universe (universe of what?) of empty space! Only when the complete analysis is properly done by mathematicians and planetary astronomers will it be possible to say whether spacetime and (general) relativity are needed at all. At this stage, one must wonder whether a theory deserves to be considered as physical that has totally missed the unmistakable relationships shown in the previous paragraph.

The additional material that I included in this Postscript, which I have not included in any previous correspondence so far, demonstrates crystal-clearly how vastly different has been the approach of this "non-expert" from that of the acknowledged as "expert" theoreticians.

Unfortunately, a description of the new electron model is quite a bit more involved to be presentable in a mere postscript. Suffice it to say that although it abolishes the principle of uncertainty, it casts the Heisenberg relationship in a totally new light and elevates it to the status of a necessary, additional, independent and deterministic fundamental Natural Law, which allows definite statements to be made regarding the truly fundamental particles out of which all bodies in the Universe are made up.

The attached copy of the Table of Contents gives a rough idea of how much more, all original and tightly Logical, I have included in my manuscript, in my humble effort for completeness, consistency and comprehensiveness. It was in this effort that I spent such a long time. The original idea took only about twenty minutes to sink in!

7

Re: PROFESSOR PAULING'S RESPONSE

LINUS PAULING INSTITUTE of SCIENCE and MEDICINE

440 Page Mill Road Palo Alto, California 94306
Telephone: (415) 327-4064
20 November 1985

Mr. George P. Stavropoulos
3 Renda Place
Green Brook, NJ 08812

Dear Mr. Stavropoulos:

I have read your letter with interest.

I am skeptical about a number of the statements made in your letter, such as the statement that the basic principles of the universe could not possibly be there by pure blind chance, and that accordingly the universe must have been created by God. I remember some physicist (Einstein, I think) saying that God must be a mathematician. One question that I would ask is, Is not the difficulty of explaining God as great as the difficulty of explaining the universe that He is assumed to have created?

However, I may tell you that if you do send me your manuscript I would not discuss the metaphysical parts of it, because of my lack of background and interest. Also, I doubt that I would discuss the cosmological parts of it, for the same reason. I may mention that I think some of your arguments about gravitation have been mentioned by other people, such as Dirac.

I am skeptical about what you say about the Bohr model and the structure of atoms, this is a field with which I am thoroughly familiar, and I suggest that you send me pages 219 to 301 of the manuscript, so that I could examine the arguments and report my opinion to you.

Sincerely,
(Signature: Linus Pauling)

Comment: Prof. Pauling's question regarding "explaining God" *in fact* places Him in the category of things *requiring prior cause*! How legitimate is this? If it is not, the answer *must be different*!

8

Re: FIRST RESPONSE TO PROFESSOR PAULING

Professor Linus C. Pauling,
L. Pauling Institute of Science & Medicine,
440 Page Mill Rd., Palo Alto, CA 94306

December 1, 1985.

Dear Professor Pauling,

I am very grateful for your letter of November 20 and your offer to read at least parts of my manuscript.

Please allow the following explanations: In my view, the Classical, all-inclusive, Platonic sense of "Reality" demands consideration of the questions of Intelligence and Wisdom and of the ways in which these are expressed in the more concrete terms of "materiality", which is the field of the physical sciences. If the Universe is "built" on an absolute minimal, most economical set of the simplest possible Laws, that are complete, mutually consistent and complementary as a set and universal in coverage, and if no reason at all can be given as to why or even how the Universe should on its-own obey such a unique set of Laws, given the clear and even more realistic possibility of innumerable, contradictory, totally chaotic "laws" and the even greater possibility of no laws at all that pure blind chance may much more likely throw into the fray, then indeed, one will be very hard pressed to deny that such a set of Laws has in fact been willed. It is not quite enough that the "right" combination should have occurred just once. In the face of pure chance, we are obliged to explain also the seamless continuity of Law. What could have possibly congealed the Law? Could this continuity be nothing more than the chancy outcome of the "dice" coming up always right every time they are "thrown", such as to give to a flower, say, its seamless beauty? God "always geometrizes", but does, or can, the Universe also do so? A mathematician may indeed posit the proposition that the velocity of light is constant at constant universal age. But how do two real (and not merely theoretical) photons, separated by a huge distance, simultaneously have the same velocity? This is no longer a mere theoretical statement. The question of practical implementation of this Law is a separate issue that also calls for its own logical resolution. That all photons in the Universe behave identically must be cause for the most profound bewilderment in a scientist's mind. At least it is in mine.

I fully agree that it is much harder by far to “explain” God than it is to explain the Universe. As mere humans, our duty seems to be to pursue our Logic to its very limit and to see what it can do for us.

I appreciate the spirit in which you decline to discuss the metaphysical or even perhaps the cosmological parts of the manuscript, on the grounds of your background and interest. Please, permit the remark that none of us ordinary humans can legitimately claim for himself a “metaphysical” background. That seems to be, it in fact is a contradiction in terms. So far at least, metaphysical revelation has been confined to the moral realm. But to the extent that the Laws of the Universe seem to require an extra-universal reference, in Gödel’s sense (Part Four), metaphysics and theology seem to be forced into our thinking, or at least so I see it, even from purely physical considerations. If truly so, I submit, they can be approached equally legitimately from the direction of science. Plato would find this entirely Logical. To him the problem of Reality was one and indivisible. It is in the same sense that I have put together my ideas. Indeed my approach to the model of the electron was born of my wider universal considerations. For this reason, I take the liberty to send you my entire manuscript, and I shall cherish any comments at all.

As regards the problem of gravitation, Dirac advanced the Large Numbers Hypothesis, from which he concluded that $G \approx t^{-1}$ *on the assumption of constant c*. I have nowhere seen any discussion at all to the effect that Newton’s law requires, *as its other face in effect, both universal expansion and variability of the velocity of light!* Our current notions about the expansion of the Universe do *not* incorporate a variable c .

Very respectfully,

9

Re: MR. TENNITY'S RESPONSE

January 22, 1986

Dear Dr. Stavropoulos:

Enclosed are the two reviews we discussed by phone.

Review #1 was done by a quantum physicist. Please note his postscript where he admits that his remarks are very blunt. I have disregarded his suggestion to temper the remarks because I believe that you can best benefit from his comments by seeing the *forcefulness* of his opinions.

Review #2 was done by a quantum chemist. His review is based on an examination of the manuscript itself.

I hope you find these reviews constructive and beneficial.

Sincerely,

ATTACHED REVIEWS: (As sent to me)

Review #1

January 3, 1986

Dear Kenneth:

I have spent some time considering the prospectus you sent me on December 12, 1985. This prospectus, for a book entitled **Principia Physica Universi**, sounds impressive on a first reading, but I would advise extreme caution.

Let me preface my remarks by a general comment: this is, in my judgment, a very poorly written prospectus. It *sounds* good, but is in fact, vague, never making clear the goals or content of the book. So I have to base these remarks on my *reading* of what *I think* the author has in mind. In fact, the vast scope of what the author is (evidently) trying to do plus the brevity of the prospectus make it almost impossible to fully evaluate the project from this material.

I am quite concerned by the lack of clarity and (possible) errors of understanding as revealed in this document. In fact, the more I read and think about these few pages, the more perplexed I become.

What the author seems to be proffering is nothing less than “the solution to the problem of the Universe”—whatever, precisely, that means. As a part of this endeavor, which, granted, is nothing if not ambitious, he claims to have formulated a theory that is “free of internal contradictions ... and unevaluated underlying assumptions”. On the face of it, this is an astounding claim.

The author claims to have developed “simple and logically fully consistent expressions free of human contingency” for the Laws of Nature. But what, precisely, does this mean? Free of cause and effect? Free of human interaction or observation? If the latter, then such a development would contradict demonstrable properties of the microscopic world, such as the observer-observed interaction that induces changes of state in quantum physics. Indeed, this very feature of reality would appear to make impossible the separation of “human contingency from the objective Law of Nature” that the author claims to have achieved.

The author appears to reject (or at least considers as irrelevant) the principle of general covariance and, as he mentions *parenthetically*, abandons the principle of the constancy of the velocity of light. From this short document, however, I have no idea why such drastic measures were required or, more important, whether his theory can explain the wealth of experimental data that supports the principles he has jettisoned.

Of even more concern is his claim (in the second paragraph on page 2) that his model “distinguishes fully between two electrons in the helium atom”. The view that “electrons in all atoms are distinguishable from each other” is not, as the author says, “contrary to the uncertainty principle”, and I see no reason why it would require “a re-interpretation of the Heisenberg relationship”. What it does violate is one of the basic principles of quantum physics: the Symmetrization Postulate (for two electrons, the Pauli Exclusion Principle). Now, there is a vast amount of direct (and indirect) experimental evidence in support of this Postulate, including spectroscopic and scattering data, and any theory that presents itself as an alternative to Quantum Mechanics must show that it is able to explain this data as accurately as the traditional model. Just because the model works for atoms with one and two [and, “possibly” (?) three] electrons is no assurance; after all the Bohr model of the atom was thought to be correct because it explained the physics of the hydrogen atom. That, however, as a fluke; the Bohr model did not work for anything else. Two or three successes does not a definitive theory make, particularly where the premises of the theory require such extreme departures from conventional modern physics.

The author’s credentials notwithstanding, I am not convinced that his knowledge of physics is sound – or (an alternative possibility) that he is capable

of expressing himself clearly. What, for example, is one supposed to make of the following sentence?

“...definite conclusions consistent with the earlier findings and testable in principle may be drawn on the basis of the Planck-Einstein relationship regarding the truly fundamental particles which compose all bodies”.

I presume the “Planck-Einstein relationship” referred to is $E = h\nu$, or perhaps $p = h/\lambda$, but whatever he means, this sentence makes no sense in or out of the context in which it appears.

Giving the author the benefit of the doubt - that he is a competent physicist and not a quack - at least one would conclude from this example and the rest of his prospectus that he is unable to express himself at a level that will prove widely accessible, or that his book will appeal to a “wide readership of practicing physicists, mathematicians, other scientists, engineers, philosophers, and historians of science, as well as students...” This means that the market for his book will likely be very limited. In this event, the only justification I can see for publishing it is if, in fact it reports a signal advance in science.

There is always the possibility that the author is, in fact, a genius who has actually uncovered a revolutionary, new formulation of the laws of nature. Suppose, for the sake of argument, that this is the case. Even in that event, publication of a book such as the one proposed is not the way to establish such a theory; rather, it must be presented and considered and put to the test in the refereed literature of physics.

There is about this prospectus the feel of a lot of mail I get from time to time; this mail comes from disaffected physicists who have been unable to get their (usually ill-founded, illogical, and insupportable) theories published in refereed literature and hence send mailings to the community at large in the hopes of finding a supporter. Please understand, *I am not asserting that this author falls into this category*; the material I was sent is simply insufficient to make a judgment. I am, however, recommending extreme caution, for there is here a lot of radical stuff and a certain amount of what may be nonsense.

[Dr. Stavropoulos

This gap represents my deletion of material which might reveal the reviewer's identity. The material deleted contained no comments germane to your work.]

P. S. I wrote these remarks for you, not for the author. Hence, they are rather blunt (although they do not overstate my opinion of this proposal). Were I writing this as an author's review, I would have tried to be more tactful. It is fine with me if you want to transmit some of them to the author, although I would prefer to remain anonymous, but if you do so, please temper them a bit.

Review #2

Comments
on

PRINCIPIA PHYSICA UNIVERSI

I do not think that Prentice-Hall should be interested in publishing this manuscript in its present form. At best it would create another Velikovsky-like furor. More likely it would be ignored by both the general public, because it doesn't feature visitors from outer space, and by scientists, because it is too full of inconsistencies for its rebuttal of current theories to be taken seriously. Even if the author's new theories are correct, they should be presented, bare of philosophy, in primary scientific journals.

I read the letters of transmittal and the first part of the manuscript fairly carefully and made notes. I will present these in the order that they were written.

Letters: From the content of the two cover letters, it seems that the material might properly be peer-reviewed and initially published in the primary scientific literature.

Preface: Section I, trying to establish the nature of "wisdom" and of "reality", reads like a great deal of sophistry. The writing style is ponderous. A lot of stylistic editing is needed. Section II, on science and religion, is more readable and more interesting, although the ideas are not new (see, for example, writings by J. B. Phillips or C. A. Coulson). Section III presents the author's justification for writing the book. His "stone that the builders had rejected" will need examining by the "experts" whose criticism he expects. The fact that he has chosen a monograph with mixed purposes, rather than the primary literature, as the vehicle for presenting his "stone" seems to violate his criterion for "reality" as set forth in Section I.

PART ONE: p. 17 near bottom: "The expanding universe as a whole does not obey the first law of thermodynamics". This is not true. One expression of the first law is

$$dU = dq - dw$$

where U is internal energy, q is heat and w is work (in some conventions, the sign of the work is reversed). If the system is closed, as the universe must be, by definition, then dU is zero, and

$$dq = dw.$$

The universe cools down on expansion because expansion against the gravitational attraction requires work.

Spontaneity is best determined by the sign of one of the free energies, A (the Helmholtz free energy) or G (the Gibbs free energy). A negative sign indicates spontaneity. The change in A

$$dA = dU - TdS$$

where T is absolute temperature and S is entropy. Again, for a closed system, dU is zero and

$$dA = -TdS$$

The spontaneity of the expansion is driven by the positive entropy change.

p. 19, top: “Kinetic” and “dynamic” energy are the same.

p. 25: The two laws of thermodynamics again are discussed erroneously .

p. 27, starting with the second paragraph: Contrary to the author’s discussion, the quote from Heisenberg is very reasonable. For things that we cannot directly observe with our senses, we can only construct models to explain them in terms of concepts with which we are familiar. These models can be conceptual, pictorial, physical, mathematical, or any combination of these. Unfortunately, the mathematical models required frequently do not match the mathematical models we have derived for phenomena that we can directly observe. Sometimes different mathematical models are required for the same thing in different experiments (for example, the wave/particle duality for photons and electrons). The language problems that Heisenberg discusses can arise when one tries to translate the mathematics into words (to quote J. Willard Gibbs, “Mathematics is a language”). They also can arise when specialists derive a jargon to communicate among themselves, but which uses words which have a different meaning in another context (for example, nuclear physicists use of the terms “color” and “charm”). These comments apply to much of the discussion in the remainder of Chapter 1.2.

PART TWO: Chapter 2.1: I will withhold most comments on the contents of this chapter until I have read further. The one comment that I will make is that the coincidence of Eq. 2a being consistent with a value of the density of the universe that falls within the current estimates, having three orders of magnitude uncertainty, is not as great as the author implies. Other values for D and T can easily be found. For example, using the length of an earthly day for time and the density of carbon dioxide at standard temperature and pressure (zero degrees Celsius and one atmosphere pressure) gives a gravitational constant which differs by only 2% from the experimental value. There are several minor comments that do not reflect on the content of the chapter. On p. 44, if a continuously updated reference is cited, the latest version should be the one cited. On p. 45, the derived value of D should be reported to only two significant figures. Throughout the section, the author is too assertive. Examples are in the use of “only” at the bottom of p. 44 and in calling Eq. 2 a “law”. On page 66, in a footnote, the author mentions that equation 2 appears at least twice in earlier literature. These

should be cited on p. 45, even if the present author only became aware of them after he had done his work.

The arguments for dismissing the cases indicated in sections 2.2, 2.3, and 2.3.1 are fairly reasonable, but are overstated. They could be presented much more succinctly

Section 2.3.2.1: The “grander” mode of expansion of the universe is inconsistent with much of the other discussion. For instance, if this mode holds, Eq. 10 has no meaning. Volume cannot be perceived to change, since there are no “rigid rods” to serve as measuring standards for distance, and hence volume. Unfortunately, the importance of this mode of expansion is repeated over and over in the manuscript. There are further inconsistencies. In section 2.3.2.10, for example, it is assumed that the earth’s crust expands at a different rate than the interior. If there can be any difference in expansion rates, why cannot there be “rigid rods” which do not expand at all?

p.64: It is not “reasonable to state that the universe expands like a perfect sphere”. The underlined statements regarding momentum and the center of the universe are correct for a motionless center of mass. They also hold for a center of mass moving with a constant velocity. However, two pieces of matter having different velocities can have the same momentum if their masses are different. A spherically symmetric expansion would require a spherically symmetric mass distribution.

p.68: The assertion of the photon as the one and only fundamental particle is inconsistent with the existence of particles (whether or not fundamental) that have half-integer spin.

p.74: From or to what does a bundle of photons gain or lose energy as it is blueshifted or redshifted?

I read the material from section 2.3.2.4 to the end of Part Two very lightly; consequently I will not comment on it.

PART THREE: I read the material in Sections ... [the photocopy supplied to me has a gap and the section numbers are not readable] fairly carefully, since quantum mechanics is my primary field of expertise. There are too many misconceptions and/or errors in these sections to list. As one small example, the author has trouble accepting the notion that an atom, in its bound states, has a negative energy. This negative energy is purely a consequence of the arbitrary, but commonly accepted, choice of the zero for energy. The customary choice is made to provide a uniform zero for all atoms. There is nothing fundamental, either from a physical or a philosophical point of view, in this choice.

GENERAL COMMENTS: My initial reaction to this work was that, if the philosophy were left out, much of the science might be publishable in the primary literature. Then if the author wanted to write a philosophy at a latter date, it might be worth doing. Unfortunately, the farther I read, the more I became con-

vinced that the science is probably not publishable in its present form. This is too bad, since the author obviously put a lot of work into it. My suggestion is that he break it down into small sections and try to find scientists who are willing to help him with both the background and the mechanics of what he is trying to do.

10

Re: PROFESSOR PAULING'S RESPONSE

LINUS PAULING INSTITUTE of SCIENCE and MEDICINE

440 Page Mill Road Palo Alto, California 94306

Telephone: (415) 327-4064

3 February 1986

Dr. George P. Stavropoulos
3 Renda Place
Green Brook, NJ 08812

Dear Dr. Stavropoulos:

I have now gone through your manuscript, page by page.

I have not found anything in it that seemed to me to be interesting or to constitute a significant contribution to our understanding of the universe. I may, of course, have missed some point. If you have made a discovery of this sort, I think that you should describe it precisely and succinctly and publish it in one of the scientific journals.

I have never done anything in the field of relativity, but I have studied thermodynamics. I am skeptical about some of the statements that you have made about thermodynamics, but my skepticism may be the result of the fact that the statements usually are not really precise.

For a discussion of thermodynamics in relation to the universe, I suggest that you read the book by Richard Chace Tolman, published by Oxford University Press perhaps 20 or 25 years ago, with the title "Thermodynamics, Statistical Mechanics, and Relativity" (or something like that). Professor Tolman was a thoroughly logical and sensible man, and, although I have not studied that book carefully, I feel that it is completely reliable.

While I was reading the book I thought that I would mention to you that I was sure that I had seen somewhere a paper on the relation between the gravitational constant and the density of matter and size of the universe. Then some pages later you gave a reference to a paper on this subject. I have not been following the field of cosmology well enough to know whether or not this relationship is rather generally accepted.

Your discussion of the hydrogen atom seems to me to be unnecessarily confusing, with the arbitrary introduction of a force restoring the electron to its average distance from the nucleus. On the other hand, the quantum mechanical theory of the hydrogen atom seems to be completely acceptable. The energy levels are predicted with extremely high accuracy. Also, the probability of transition from one level to another is calculated with similar accuracy. You introduce the quantum theory in your discussion, in a rather arbitrary way, by introducing the quantity h . I think that I have to say that I see no justification for your treatment of the hydrogen atom.

I can make the same statement about your treatment of the helium atom. With the aid of computers, it is now possible to calculate the energy levels of the helium atom and of heavier atoms with as much accuracy as is desired, and so far no case has been found in which there is a difference between the calculated value and the observed value, to within the errors implicit in the calculation. I agree with other physicists in saying that the theory of quantum mechanics seems to be completely satisfactory for atoms and molecules.

I am sorry that my study of your manuscript has not led me to be able to mention one point that I consider to be a significant contribution to our understanding of the nature of the world. It may be, of course, that there is such a point, or even more than one, in the manuscript, but I did not find any.

Sincerely,

11

Re: REPLY TO MR. TENNITY'S RESPONSE

Mr. Kenneth Tennity,
Science Editor,
Prentice-Hall, Inc.,
643A Tremont St.,
P.O.Box 5,
Boston, MA 02118

February 3, 1986.

Dear Mr. Tennity,

I want to thank you for your call of Tuesday Jan. 21, and I am indebted to you for your sending me unexpurgated copies of the Reviewers comments. I am glad you recognize the need to get as close as is possible to each others' minds. Your letter arrived on Saturday Jan. 25, just as I was finishing a detailed "**List of Questions the Reviewers must answer**", answers to which I expected the Reviewers would consider themselves duty-bound to provide, which answers would be valuable to you in deciding on the merits of my submission. Enclosed herewith, please, find a copy of that list. Only after I finished that list did I open your letter. I shall leave it to you to decide, by comparison, on how the Reviewers discharged their duties.

I consider the publication of my manuscript too important a project to allow it to be placed in jeopardy by comments such as the two Reviewers were able to provide. I shall, therefore, answer every point of substance raised by them. To do less would be playing into their hands, as it were. I beg your indulgence for the length of this letter, but there is no way out, for I do not intend to assert but to prove and to demolish their pseudo-arguments.

Quite honestly, I fully sympathize with you, for you have been placed in a very awkward position: Here is an opportunity for you to score an important publication success, if my claims are correct; here is what would really have helped you make up your mind on this admittedly difficult matter, since you alone bear the ultimate responsibility for your decisions and their quality; and here indeed is the quality of the reviews you have received!

You will recall that *you* originally proposed that it would be worth the while attempting to obtain reviews with the author's identity withheld from the reviewers, in recognition of the fact that reviewers do not remain unbiased when the author's identity is already known to them before they complete their task. To that proposal *I acceded*, as increasing the likelihood of obtaining more objec-

tive reviews than the current reviewing process permits, the weaknesses of which I was glad to find you recognized. The fundamental predicament and possible inability of any reviewer to raise himself above his own and current prejudices of all kinds, in passing judgment on a novel piece of work at such great odds with currently accepted notions, *remains in any case*, but this fact, and *no less* than any other, must *also* be weighed before a final decision is made. To the end of weighing this built-in weakness, the quality of my correspondence and theirs, I trust, will be found helpful, and should you desire it, I would indicate specific places in my manuscript where you could better assess the absolute seriousness and total commitment with which I approached, from the beginning, this work, namely, *long before* this correspondence was started.

As you told me on Jan. 21, in the attempt to secure reviews independent of author's-known-identity-induced bias, you only partially succeeded, since you were asked and you somehow felt obliged to reveal my identity to Reviewer #2, who later admitted to you that he ran to the lists of references to establish my previous publication record in the field! As if that could have *any* legitimate bearing on the present subject, which is the evaluation of the publishability of a book full of totally original and previously unpublished ideas! As if, e.g., Einstein could have avoided rejection of his 1905 special relativity paper, if the same standard were then applied, namely, one's established record! [So, it appears inevitable that we *must now* conclude that academic freedom *has since been restricted*, in order that it better protect from *open public attack* what is now called "established scientific opinion"!—Comment added at the time of preparing this material for the present publication.] I do not and shall not hold this against you, Mr. Tennity. I do not mind my identity being revealed, possible warts showing notwithstanding. And I sympathize with you, for the extra difficulty thus added to your task.

For it now is a fact, on which you will agree with me, that Reviewer #2, by yielding to the temptation to know and by learning of the author's identity before passing judgment, *proved himself unable to pass independent judgment* on the material before him, and thus to a great extent, he disqualified his final judgment, if indeed he developed one objectively useful to you.

[Besides, there is the *need* that reviewers *must be exceptional in ability to rise themselves to the demands of a task asking of them to pass judgment on a work that even with its title challenges established dogma*: Had I wanted to recite current knowledge, I would have called my book "Principles of Modern Science"; but I did not! The title of the work ought to have alerted them to that here indeed was something *altogether other* than what they were used to!: Gravity existed long before Newton discovered it, nature functioned long before Stephenson and Carnot (engineers *not* physicists) began pondering on the principles of operation of steam engines. The *Universe*, the principles of which were here to be examined, in no way obliges us to abide by what we, since the seventeenth century, began taking as immovable

“facts”! So, the material before the reviewers obliged then to see it in a light *totally other* than the established blinders allow. *Both* reviewers missed what *I* considered to be my obligation: to handle my task *in the Universal light that the dimensional analysis of Newton’s Universal law of gravitation casts on all matters, barring none, pertaining to the Universe!* It is not a light matter that *they both failed* to make the slightest comment on the *dimensional analysis* I used. I avoided throwing it in from the beginning, because *I had already found out* that even astronomers-mathematicians had no conception of what that is, which is a matter that no engineer worth his salt may possibly ignore! So, I presented my proposals from the findings point of view in hopes of exciting their interest, rather than certainly putting them from the start on the defensive, even in their consciences, for their demonstrable failure to pass their considerations from that *never-erring* sieve!— This comment added on preparing this material for this publication.]

But Reviewer #1, also, showed himself no less concerned with the competence of the author, as he amply demonstrates, of which later. Thus both Reviewers placed their primary emphasis on who speaks, than on what is being said! At least, Reviewer #1 did not submit to the aforementioned temptation, a fact that I am glad of and recognize!

Thus looked from the distance, the picture is as follows: Both Reviewers reviewed the material with a view to the author’s “competence as a physicist”, his being a “quack” or a “genius” (Rev. #1) and his not being an established author in the field as the lists of references clearly show (Rev. #2). It follows that their comments were *in effect* addressed as much to the writer as a person as to the objective value of the material in their front. I take it that Reviewer #2 only avoided specific comments about the author because he already knew my identity and was concerned about my feelings. For this, I thank him. But had I happened to have an illustrious name, or to share one (in which case running to the lists of references is totally useless as well as misleading), there can be no doubt that the comments of Reviewer #2 would have been totally different, specifically in view of the claims made in my “prospectus” (my first letter to you of Nov. 7, 1985), and of the depth and extent of the material and its (let us only say, potential) importance, that I covered in my manuscript. For, the reader of Review #2 is left with absolutely no inkling as to what such a complex work is all about, compared to which, the few comments made pale in significance, even if they had some merit, of which also later.

In this, then, both Reviewers tacitly admitted their inability to judge the material presented to them *on its own* merits! This I find extremely important, as I will now proceed to show: There exists in the Old Testament (Numbers, 22, 28-30) the story of the ass of Balaam, to which the Lord God gave during one famous occasion the ability of human voice and the opportunity to engage in *meaningful* conversation with her master! (Whether this phenomenon actually occurred, as some may object, is besides the point. Even in a myth, Balaam *had*

to make a choice!). What was he to do? Dismiss his ass' sayings purely because they emanated from her mouth? Or to consider them in view of their obvious making perfect sense? In this, Balaam chose the second and far wiser choice. Our present Reviewers, several thousand years later, seem to prefer the first! Today, we already anticipate the day of "truly intelligent computers", the "intelligence" of which will far exceed our own, or so it is claimed: How are we to judge their "outpourings of wisdom", if we do not ourselves subject them to *our own independent criticism*, without depending, that is, on the computer's own data banks, which the computer itself *could* falsify, at least as regards its own success record in its attempt to impress us, or even cheat us? In this respect then, in the present case, *both* reviewers in reality relegated to others (the referees of the journals) the responsibility to decide on the matter of the quality of this work, conveniently hiding behind currently fashionable, yet trite pseudo-arguments as to where new ideas must be published, under penalty of rejection should they be presented elsewhere. In this age of science and of freedom, if it truly is, both Reviewers have adopted the policy of the Grand Inquisitor, too anxious to protect the "ignorant" populace from potentially dangerous (to whom?) ideas, while for themselves preferring the positions of his underlings: All important matters must be referred to the man himself, lest they themselves be involved in the spreading of heresy! Besides, they all wear masks, so whom have they to fear, or be ashamed of? University professors (as I take the two Reviewers to be), leaders in their fields, if they truly are, they are indeed expected to do much better than that! Do you not agree, Mr. Tennity? After all, in the present case, *you are* the publisher of a "journal" that accepts manuscripts that mix science and philosophy (which is your *modus operandi*). Do they presume to suggest that you refrain from such an activity, in effect that you go out of the business of publishing original works in these fields??? That *would* be some presumption indeed!!! Who are they to tell you what *you* should do? Who are they to feel it their right to restrict the trade of ideas, or to monopolize its outlets???

Unfortunately, this (their shrugging of responsibility) is still possible because reviewers (the two involved in the present case included by their own tacit admission) most jealously insist (and for no good reason that can reasonably be claimed to serve science best) on their anonymity, while the publishers need them for their "expert" opinions, of which situation they demand to take advantage. On my part, I have from the beginning emblazoned my name on my work and correspondence and have already deposited a copy of the manuscript at the Office of Copyright, thereby demonstrating "*mea culpa*" in cases of trivial errors, oversights, mistypings, as well as on the far more important matter of the logic of the main ideas. As specifically applies to the present case, the two Reviewers do not seem to have the courage to issue an uncluttered, unequivocal, well reasoned judgment on the basis of *all* the evidence before them, against

which they should also have weighed the overall significance of their own comments (specifically applying to Reviewer #2), or the courage to withhold *all* judgment if the evidence (*they* decided to consider) was “insufficient” (specifically applying to Reviewer #1). In the latter case, *it is curious in the extreme* that the Reviewer *preferred* to engage *in pure speculation*, rather than seek *really* to study the manuscript *that had been made available!!!* That both Reviewers did not have that courage, that both Reviewers played on both sides of the fence (to be on the “safe” side), I *shall* now prove. I shall take the statements and arguments of each one of them separately:

Review #1

Consider the statements (p. 1) “This prospectus ... sounds impressive on a first reading” and “this is, in my judgment, a very poorly written prospectus”. How, reasonably, can it possibly be both, all at once??? Can a “quack” know enough to write a prospectus that the experts find, even on a first reading “impressive”? His already knowing enough to write an “impressive” prospectus, does it not really automatically disqualify him as a “quack”? Consider the statement (p. 2, bottom) “Giving the author the benefit of the doubt ... — at least one would conclude from this example and the rest of his prospectus (already called “impressive on a first reading”, remember, — parenthesis inserted) that he is unable to express himself at a level that will prove widely accessible” and the statement (p. 3) “There is always the possibility that the author is, in fact, a genius who has actually uncovered a revolutionary, new formulation of the laws of nature”. I am asking: What difference does it make whether I am a quack or a genius, or even the re-incarnation of the ass of Balaam? The duty at hand is to evaluate the sense of *all* material presented (cover letters as well as the manuscript) and not only what the Reviewer prefers to limit himself to while admitting it to be “insufficient” (p. 3, middle), of which he takes advantage to engage in such casuistries! Would that sense be dismissed if I were the ass of Balaam, or the “computer”, or if my manuscript had fallen from the sky? I shudder at the competence in Logic that these statements demonstrate. In the very least, “the possibility ... (of) genius”, that the Reviewer kindly still leaves open in spite of all his earlier statements to the contrary possibility, should have cautioned him against making equivocal judgments or the statement (p. 1, par. 2) “it sounds good, but is in fact, vague, never making clear the goals and contents of the book”. What if the “genius” for reasons of his own *deliberately* decided to write a most comprehensive prospectus? What other reasons could there have been than to save some of his own and his reader’s precious time, since *he appended* the table of contents of the book *and simultaneously offered* the book for a most thorough examination? One must indeed shudder at the inability of “experts”,

who permit themselves to be hired to review important books, to extract the important essence out of only two pages of material! Consider further, Mr. Tennity, the truly astounding statement “so I have (which *he did not have* to do since the manuscript *had already been offered* — parenthesis inserted) to base these remarks on my *reading* of what I *think* (emphases in the original) the author has in mind”, on the basis of which he proceeds to write the balance of his comments and charge you with his fee! That he *evidently* failed to think correctly of what I had in mind is proven by the fact that had he thought correctly, he would have had my entire (no less!) text in his mind’s eye and thus proceeded to review *it* without actually ever taking physical delivery of the manuscript!!! How far short of thinking correctly he came, thereby exposing himself to the corresponding judgment, is evidenced by the comments he proceeded to make, that can easily be juxtaposed to the riches of my work. Further, he wonders about what I mean by “human contingency”. Now, this really shows an “expert” that is unable to tell for himself what is human contingency in our “laws of physics” and what is truly given us by Mother Nature! If our “laws of physics” were free of human contingency, and thus no other than the Laws of Nature, and thus *sufficient in themselves*, they most likely would have already provided us with the final solutions for some time now, and we would no longer feel it necessary to engage in all this miserable and most disagreeable correspondence!

Consider also the statement (p. 2, 2/3 down) “I am not convinced ... that he is capable of expressing himself clearly” together with the statements mentioned earlier “... possibility ... is, in fact, a genius” and “... prospectus ... sounds impressive on a first reading”. How on Earth can one avoid the charge of engaging in casuistry, if one holds to the view that an author cannot express himself clearly while writing impressively and possibly being a genius???

On the Reviewer’s wonderment [this comment escaped me at the time of answering to Mr. Tennity—it is added now on preparing this material for publication] regarding the “Planck-Einstein relationship”, I simply meant nothing more than what Planck found himself forced to introduce, namely the h , which Einstein also found in his analysis of the photoelectric phenomenon, *for which alone* he was awarded the Nobel prize, and *not* for his relativity theories, which remains unknown to the vast majority of the general public as well as, as it now seems, to a good deal of *seeming* “experts”.

The reason why this Review is so convoluted, on the basis of which I cannot honestly return the compliment of its being impressive even on a first reading, is that it is far more a record of its author’s reactions on reading my material and far less a rational analysis of the latter: On first reading, this Reviewer was unbiased. Then, after some puzzlement and reflection, he must have begun a second reading while also trying to make sense of it all, yet on the basis of *what he already knew* [that *never* considered the Universe as an *organized whole under Law*—comment added] *before he ever* cast eyes on my material!

Before finishing with this review, I must make some additional but technical remarks: The Heisenberg principle of uncertainty forbids us to say anything at all with confidence (beyond what it itself allows) as regards the goings-on inside the “wave packet” or the “electronic cloud”, far less to let us give, *simultaneously*, values to the properties of the various electrons therein. Whereas the Bohr theory presented a *physical* model, however flawed, for the one electron in the hydrogen atom, current quantum theory has dismissed *all physical models* and is considering only mathematical quantities to which physical significance is attributed *a posteriori*, without there necessarily being *actual physical* entities possessing those quantities. To say, e.g., that in this particular state of the helium atom, electron one *has exactly* this much energy and *is here*, and electron two *has exactly* that much energy and *is there*, all this is indeed against the uncertainty principle. Contrary to current views, my model of the electron permits precisely such statements, as my manuscript *amply proves*. The Pauli exclusion principle as currently used refers only to “spin” which is just another mathematical quantity of *not necessarily more* than theoretical significance, except when viewed in the context of the *current* theory. No one ever saw an electron spinning and measured its spin. Certain mathematical quantities entering the *current* theory can be interpreted *as if* the electrons were spinning. Even the purely theoretical notion of “spinning without a top”, however, permits a distinction to be made between the two electrons in helium, which is *evidently* contrary to the Reviewer’s assertion that my claim of distinguishability of electrons contravenes the Pauli principle! This is not, however, what I had in mind. The interpretation of the helium spectrum permitted by my model of the electron does not use the notion of spin. Whether at some later stage of development, some notion of spin is re-introduced and whether that spin is even numerically equal to that currently in mind is still unknown. A *successful physical* model may not need at all the current notion of spin, and so it is inappropriate to judge the future on the basis of mathematical quantities presently admitted in the current theory! However, the current theory, with its glorious successes never for a moment ceases to be a theoretical construct of immense heuristic value, that must not be replaced before a theory of still greater mathematical accuracy comes along. Yet, the current theory most definitely is *not* a *physical* theory and it is for this reason that the physical interpretation of quantum mechanics is still up in the air. Its mathematical quantities have proven their value even without such interpretation. (What I mean here by a physical theory is a model introducing, *a priori*, physical entities of preassigned properties from which the spectra observed *necessarily* follow). As a result, the sane course for the present is to retain the current theory for its heuristic value without giving up with the search for a physical model that ultimately *must* provide the fully satisfying answers. My model begins to clear the way towards making full physical sense, in a manner that the

Bohr model never did. I can only refer the reader to my manuscript. More I cannot do. It is very regrettable that this Reviewer shows himself to prefer speculating than reading.

Review #2

This review is so different from the previous one that an uninformed party cannot possibly recognize it as referring to the same work.

The opening paragraph and the final General Comments are the places where the publisher will naturally focus attention. And here, too, as in the other review, the reader finds the same equivocation: Consider the statements (p. 1) “it is too full of inconsistencies” [obviously as seen from within the *current* “understanding”, *not* the *Universal* perspective! — comment inserted] and *immediately following* “even if the author’s new theories are correct, they should be presented bare of philosophy ...” and the statements (in the General Comments.) “much of the science might be publishable” and “Unfortunately, the farther I read, the more I became convinced that the science is probably not publishable in its present form” [to mess in well with *current* views — comment added]. You did not pay, I *must* assume, Mr. Tennity, for such equivocations, but for a *balanced and well reasoned* appraisal [of a work you expected to be judged as a whole *on its own merits, not as to how well it messes with current views!* — comment added], after which *you* would decide if my work is publishable. As to the objective value and ultimate fate of my theories, the Reviewer does not even come close to offering an opinion, although it is only to that that he focuses! He does not even offer you an idea of how my theories *in their substance [and as a whole]* look from another perspective [but *not* necessarily as to whether or not they agree with current views! Anyone more than a freshman can see that mine is a *wholly new* view of the world! — last two comments added].

For reasons that are nowhere explained, the opening paragraph begins with a most presumptuous “suggestion”. It is put in the subjunctive only for reasons of decorum. Here the Grand Inquisitor himself banishes a book!!! He is above having to give reasoned arguments! I take it, you will agree, that from the publisher’s viewpoint, the manuscript review is only pertinent in so far as it endeavors to establish the *basic, internal* logic of the work (*regardless*, that is, of currently held opinions), its intrinsic value that alone can induce the public to buy the book, and the number of copies it will sell. Not only does the Reviewer not help you on these questions, but in his opening sentence, he in effect orders you to stop the presses, as it were! The corporate structure of the publisher, its ethical principles, its responsibilities, and its duty to make the final judgment, all these the author of that sentence ignores. Even if in name only a Doctor of Philosophy, the author of the review should have realized that his own duties as a

reviewer acting on your behalf (having that in mind *all your* interests) was only to provide answers to questions, at least as many and such as those that my own clearly inferred and tacitly suggested "incompetence" was able to list [that I send herewith]. How many such questions he did answer, whether he did so correctly, where true incompetence is more likely to be found, is now clear. It looks as though the Reviewer is totally ignorant of that there is out there a corporate world that is not made up of ivory towers, that does have to make important decisions for the benefit of its stockholders-employees-society, in light of which obligation, it may not be averse to "another Velikovsky-like furor" (which was the last comment I expected on my work and an intention that I *never* entertained), which from the publisher's viewpoint was a singular success and as a study of world annals an important literary contribution! One out there does also expect a Doctor of Philosophy to be able to recognize that the publisher's duty is to disseminate, and for a fair remuneration, ideas. If public morals are offended, the Reviewer can only explain how. The decision to publish offensive material is the author's and the publisher's, under established law. The ultimate fate itself of the ideas must rest solely with the readership. Here, then, we have the phenomenon of a reviewer unable to provide an even minimally acceptable report, unable to decide in his own mind (otherwise that "Even if..." of the first paragraph and those "might be" and "probably not" of the last should not have appeared) the objective value of the manuscript, unable to comprehend the dynamics of the corporate publishing world, who from on high suggests that you, and without any remuneration, act as a protector of the ideas currently held dear, which you must see it as your duty to defend against even possible "rebuttal"! One would have expected, at least, to be told what it is in this manuscript that conceivably "would create another Velikovsky-like furor", but even this the Reviewer does not find it to be his duty to indicate! It is also *evident* that this Doctor of Philosophy Reviewer has an aversion to philosophy! The big title, he doubtless relishes to bask under, the substance and responsibilities of it are that much bothersome baggage! Here is this "incompetent" author who undertook, in the words of the other Reviewer "this endeavor, which, granted is nothing if not ambitious", namely, to set down the principia physica Universi, and here, too, is a "competent" Reviewer who does not hesitate to issue his "I do not think (you) should ...", yet is totally unable to realize that such a task as the author undertook could not even have started without a *very* great deal of *sound* philosophy, who believes that the science of the Universe "should be presented bare of philosophy" in like-minded "scientific journals"! Here indeed is a human, a "competent" Reviewer of the work of others, presumably a university professor who is yet not transfixed at the awesomeness of the Universe and its Laws, yet, feels free to issue his "should"s! Speaking of conceit!!! This analysis alone, I submit, demonstrates not only the total philosophical (by his own demonstration, of which

later) immaturity but also the intellectual competence of this Reviewer. If this review is to guide, it *must* be seen in the light of this analysis.

In the “Letters” paragraph, the key sentence reads “it seems that the material might properly be peer-reviewed ...”. Pray, please, tell me what on Earth did the Reviewer think he was doing as regards this manuscript for which he was paid?

In the “Preface” paragraph, the opening sentence reads “Section I, trying to establish the nature of ‘wisdom’ and ‘reality’ reads like a great deal of sophistry”. I reread that section and the only change I may have to make is to capitalize the R, possibly also the W. I believe the charge of sophistry to be a serious one that cannot just be pontificated but *sufficiently* proven, if it is to stick. An accuser, who deliberately fails to provide *sufficient* proof of such a serious charge, is thus showing himself to be the true sophist, if not also a libeler. Whether Section I is sophistry or something totally different is of course open to any reader to decide for himself. Another gentleman who only read the Preface commented that it “requires thoughtful consideration”, but “only a relatively small handful are motivated to understand the underlying principles involved in their fields of study. This is unfortunate, but it is a fact”. I did not and still do not believe it as a fact, for that would be an awful indictment of the body scientific, but here we have a Reviewer who considers fundamental matters of Reality that science endeavors to fathom as sophistry! Unless the Reviewer is also a scholar of the Greek language and in full possession of the immense meaning that the centuries have bestowed on the Greek terms I there employed, to which the English equivalents are only dictionary approximations, I can only conclude that he only read, but understand he did not! For a man of learning, he does not even seem to realize that his arrows do indeed boomerang and have already destroyed his own credibility! As regards the comment on Section III, I note that the Reviewer noticed my statement about “the stone that the builders had rejected” and that indeed I was thereby challenging the “experts” to examine closely this work. It is therefore truly curious that not only does he not provide the reader with any inkling as to my philosophical position which he pontificates as sophistry, he does not even explain what it is that I called the “stone”, which he mentions, whether I was right in that characterization, what I myself built by and upon that “stone”! He has utterly failed to grasp this last opportunity in his report (before he embarks on technical matters), which is a document that corporate directors with very little time will rely upon to make an important decision, to explain to them what I tried to do and why I failed, *if* I failed! Why does he keep them *evidently, deliberately* in the dark? Is there the same ulterior motive behind this failure as there was behind his implied admonition to avoid “another Velikovsky-like furor”, which he also disdained to explicate? He further claims that the “vehicle” of presentation I chose “seems to violate his (i. e., my) criterion of ‘reality’ as

set forth in Section I”, allegedly shown by “the fact that he (i.e., I) has (i.e., have) chosen a monograph with mixed purposes” for my presentation. Perhaps nothing could more clearly show this Reviewer’s *careless* reading: Precisely because I considered Reality as an indivisible whole, on which basis, no part of it can be considered as finally understood until the whole is put into proper perspective; precisely because I realized that one cannot be inducted to the consideration of the whole except by a methodical procession by degrees, building carefully upon the most solid pieces of Reality that we can trust and not upon *any* human supposition inserted a priori into such a momentous undertaking; I did *not*, *could not*, have mixed purposes in my mind, *nor* could I consider it permissible to me to split my program or its presentation. Quite the contrary: had I done so, then indeed I would have betrayed my purpose! I grant that a complete handling of the problem of Reality would require a different title for its presentation from the one used for my work, but having by no means exhausted that huge project, if it ever can be exhausted by a mere mortal, I could not possibly have decided on a more proper title. I thus resolved to use the lesser title that I did use on the understanding, which, I thought, would be quite clear to the careful reader after he had read my *entire* work and had adequately reflected on it, that I had limited myself to the lesser task of presenting (some of) the *physical principles* only, upon which the Universe could have been built *as a fully logical object*, much as principles bear upon the functions of a complex architectural structure, and of only introducing, *timidly*, in Part Four of my work to the vast area of Reality beyond the merely physical. All this, the objective reader of my work and of this Reviewer’s critique will have objectively to conclude, has remained totally beyond this Reviewer’s grasp! By nowhere acknowledging the proper program of such an endeavor and its internal dynamics (which remained foreign to him to the very end, for he never saw this work with anything wider than the breath-obstructing blinders of “present understanding”, on the basis of which he finally suggested that I “break it down into small sections” the better to fit those blinders, for which task, he concluded that, I needed “to find scientists who are willing to help him (i.e., me) with both the background and the mechanics of what he is (i. e., I am) trying to do”, because left to my own devices I evidently insist on trying to see the Whole, whereas with the help of others I might perhaps be persuaded to break that Sacred Whole up into small pieces, neatly fitting our current “understanding”), *by nowhere in his critique indicating even to the existence of a Part Four, he conveniently evaded* the very issue raised in Section I of my Preface, which he pontificated as “sophistry”. Introductorily, above, I charged careless reading. Less charitably, one might charge intellectual dishonesty, but this would assume an on the whole *deliberate* act. In the middle ground lies utter incomprehension. I honestly do not know which is the case, and I shall not speculate. *Only* the Reviewer can answer. “Mixed purposes”, where in fact do

not objectively exist, can *only* be seen by those who utterly fail to see the Problem of Reality *on the whole*. Given the absence in “the primary literature” of any carrier suitable to carry such a program as I undertook, for which I cannot possibly be held responsible, it was only natural that I should choose the monograph as the only proper vehicle. (Are we going to deny the writer altogether to have *some* say as to how he would like to present his own work? Where do both Reviewers find that I have an obligation to conform to the form of “the primary literature”?). Moreover, I honestly thought, *this would present the “experts” with the whole target to concentrate their fire on*, not only during the monograph peer-reviewing stage (which objectively can only be done by, let us say, one or two or even three persons), but later on also, when, with the whole work now in public view, anyone could have an opportunity to examine it on the whole. Reality is indivisible. It cannot be cut up to fit the microscope, nor be removed far enough to fit the telescope, because it is everywhere. The examiner has no right to demand that Reality be split up to fit his constraints, or his whims. To insist on such a view is unbecoming arrogance. Rather, he should see it as his duty to develop a new instrument capable of examining that indivisible whole. Evidently, this Reviewer does not think so. Evidently, for the trees missing the Forest, this Reviewer failed to see his far weightier responsibilities! A bad article can (and *has*) slip(ped) through without a great loss, but a bad book slipping through is a far more serious matter. *Even worse by far is a good book being stopped* by an incompetent Reviewer. It is thus clearly shown that during *this peer-review*, it is the Reviewer rather who failed the test and not the author.

On the criticisms of Part I, p.17 and 25, the Reviewer has missed the whole point. The question is *not* to write down some formulae, as he did, but rather to ask *whether we are permitted* to write for the Universe, *unendingly expanding* (as a fundamental stipulation) *and thus never being at equilibrium*, the formulae which he wrote down, which he took with all their heavy baggage of significance straight out of the classical theory of *equilibrium* thermodynamics! That early in my work and before this *fundamental* issue could be decided, I resolved, *deliberately*, to discuss the matter in words only, not feeling it proper to mix together stampeding cattle and rare fine china, as it were! Evidently, this Reviewer has no such qualms! More simply put, the question I wanted to raise (already having in mind what was to develop on the whole, which however was not naturally yet presented to the reader) was whether δq (and *not* dq) = $\delta w \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$. But T was not yet properly introduced, and so, I could not write down such mathematical expressions. Since this was only an Introduction, serving as a platform to raise some fundamental questions on the physics of the Universe as a whole, I trusted the reader would bear with me until the whole exposition lay bare before him and would not rush to pass judgment on the basis of heretofore “understanding”. Here again, this Reviewer is too impatient with his judgment.

His expression “expansion driven by the positive entropy change” is pure nonsense (and indicates a fundamental ignorance of the concept of entropy that has caused untold misery to both student *and* teacher alike!) before we know (*not think* we know) what entropy, in this instance, *universal entropy* means. When the time came, I discussed these matters exhaustively in Section 2.3.2.8, where I arrived at the same conclusion as in Section 1.1. Curiously, the Reviewer had nothing to say on Section 2.3.2.8! Here we have another example, provided by the Reviewer, of rushing to write mathematics before securing the essence of things thus symbolized, what the man can do who ignores philosophy!

On the comment on p.19, I stand corrected: “dynamic” was wrong, “potential” is the term I had in mind and should have used.

With the comment on p.27, the problem of putting mathematics before physical substance and the essence of the problem of why quantum mechanics has not yet been definitively “interpreted” finally come to the fore. Mathematically-minded theoreticians have no difficulty starting with mathematics and only later, a posteriori, do they worry with the problem of finding physical entities, to which, rather arbitrarily, they attach all the heavy symbolism. This, in many learned quarters, passes for physical science, but in reality is only giving an *artificial* materiality to mere mental constructs. I shall not deny them their right to do so. But the true task of physical science is to explain the material, *objective* World out there, and *not* what we, a priori, imagine! The objective, “out there” World, through the power of its objectivity (i.e., its total independence of the human mind) *is logically possessing of form*, thus being *picturable in the classical sense*. When pressed, current theoreticians say that we should regard the photon or the electron only as mere concepts! It is *not* concepts that light the day, *nor* concepts that cause electrical discharges, and it is these phenomena (i.e., entities possessing of form, or else they *cannot φαίνονται cannot* be visible) that cry out for explanation. This was the thrust of Chapter 1.2, that physical entities must be given priority absolute over our concepts, our task being to find the true physical entities and establish their properties and the Laws they obey which together make up the unique, objective reality that we call the physical Universe. I submit that this is not so subtle a difference in terms as to be easy to miss! Yet, missed it also was!

On the comment on Part Two, Ch. 2.1, my reply is as follows: There is nothing coincidental about Eq. 2a. The Reviewer again missed the significance of the arguments leading *singularly* to Eq. 2a, which also justifies that “only” (p.44, bottom) to which he also objects (which, incidentally, should have been underlined, despite the Reviewer's assertion of the author's assertiveness). At a minimum, G is already a physical universal quantity in the sense that it applies *to all* gravitational phenomena. This is known since Newton. What *I added* was the question whether G is also a physical quantity that applies to the Universe as

a whole. *It is this FUNDAMENTAL QUESTION upon which my whole work is based*, about “the stone (G) that the builders had rejected”. The stress (“the author is too assertive”) that I used throughout my work, I tried to make it proportional to the significance of terms thus singled out in conjunction with their logical and physical necessity. The stress used just above is fully justified by the findings of my work: For if the above question is answered in the affirmative, as my work demonstrates that it must be, *important logical and physical consequences can be expected to follow as a matter of inexorable necessity*. This is the power of dimensional analysis carried to its utmost extreme of applicability, namely, to the entire Universe. It is not I, a mere mortal, who asserts thus, it is the force of Logic and physical necessity. Engineers have long used the method of dimensional analysis and it appears that the density-time-G dimensional connection *had* been employed before to derive expressions *similar* to Eq. 2. What *had not* been done before was to have recognized not only a *mere dimensional coincidence*, at which those earlier expressions only pointed, but the *intrinsic connection itself of the quantities G, D and T applying to a SINGULAR physical quantity that is no other than the entire Universe!!!* This is *not* a minute difference in terms that can be pushed under the carpet and forgotten—or wrongfully claimed! The Reviewer’s example of how one can arrive at some “pseudo-G” value differing from the real universal quantity G by only 2% *is a mere coincidence*. One can always find some “reasonable” mixture of gases and some “reasonable” time period to hit the value of G on the spot. What does that prove? Mixing ἑτέρα ἐκάτερα (that is, things *totally unrelated*) does not an argument make. This has always been a fundamental position in Logic. To make use of it as an argument, the Reviewer *is obligated to show* that the length of the earthly day and the density of carbon dioxide under “standard” conditions relate to the *same (which?)* physical entity. Can he do that? He also *is obligated to show* that that entity, purely accidental, can be used interchangeably with the *entire* Universe, which the universal use of G in the first sense clearly and reasonably inducts us to question as the ground for the universality of G in the second sense as a most logical possibility. Unless the Reviewer, or somebody else, can show these two “obligations”, such an argument is *not* logically constructed and thus *not* an argument at all [permitted to escape through the teeth of a sitting university professor — comment added]! I consciously chose to place the footnote on p.66 and not earlier, because only there (on p.66) was I finally able to arrive at *a far more* important result, which I had not been able to do before in the development of the argument, namely, to arrive at a result structurally identical to that arrived at for the Einstein-deSitter *pseudo*-“universe” by way of general relativity, a tortuous way at best, *but directly from Newton's Law*, with the *added great advantage* that the quantities G, D and T used in my derivation could be assigned *physically* to the Universe, which is impossible to do for the corresponding

quantities arrived at by way of general relativity. If this does not make a world of difference, I honestly do not know what does! The most that I can be charged with is the delay (from p.45 to p. 66) to acknowledge a *mere visual* similarity (of T as the *age* of the Universe and the *totally unspecified* time t used in the Einstein-deSitter equation), to which I plead guilty for reasons *both* of textual economy and *Logical substance*, the latter obliging me *not* to mix concepts *totally unrelated both as to their substance and their source, and thus not to give undue credit where none is due*. [For the sake of total clarity, I now find it necessary to present the above lines from “The most I can be ... ” to “where none is due” edited. My original reply to Mr. Tennity to the end of the paragraph read: “The most that I can be charged with is the delay (from p.45 to p. 66) to acknowledge a mere optical similarity, to which I plead guilty for reasons of textual economy. (Above, I used the terms “optically similar” and “structurally identical” as equivalent. A mathematician would use “formally identical”, but this may be taken to connote a strong intrinsic bond that does not exist in this case)”]

On the comment on Sect. 2.2, 2.3 and 2.3.1, I reply that I was fully aware that I was overstating those cases. I chose to do so in order to avoid *all* possible surprises that could be thrown against my thesis. I did not want to leave a stone unturned that could possibly be thrown against me. I wanted to give the devil *every* benefit of doubt. In return, I gained for myself the satisfaction of securing my arguments, for which I had the remark of insuccinctness coming! In the same way, one might say, that *if I succeed in overthrowing every single objection raised in this critique of my work, I will have provided my own review, as it were!*

On the comment on Sect. 2.3.2.1, the proper reply is that the Reviewer again demonstrates his total failure to realize the power of dimensional analysis, on the basis of which Eq. 10 was written. He states that “Volume cannot be perceived to change, since there are no ‘rigid rods’ to serve as measuring standards ...”. Does he mean to say that on seeing a balloon projecting against the clear sky and inflating before his very eyes, he will deny its inflation on the grounds that he forgot to bring along his measuring tape? Does he deny the passage of time every time he forgets his watch at home? The universal volume expands in proportion to T^2 on the *sufficient physical grounds* of Eq. 10, under constant G and M. Under the “grander” mode of expansion, *everything expands in proportion*, this being the simplest universal expansion law imaginable, and under it *there are no* “rigid rods”! Their absence does *not, cannot*, prevent the Universe from ageing. In Sect. 2.3.2.10 (the Reviewer admits to having read “very lightly” all the material from Sect. 2.3.4.4 to the end of Part Two), I examined the evidence of the expansion of the Earth. There, I could not deny the evidence before me, nor ignore the contributions of other mechanisms having a bearing on the subject. It *is* conceivable that a linear dimension of a complex body, for a

short period of time, expand with a rate different from the rate $(r/R)c$ under the combined contributions of all mechanisms operating upon it. But at the age $T = 0$, *all* bodies in the Universe, being parts of the Universe, *had zero linear dimensions*. This was so on the *sufficient* grounds of T being zero. Similarly, at $T = \infty$, not only all the Universe will have an infinite size, but also every single body in it, down to the fundamental particles, will also have infinite size. Why this is so, the Reviewer would have found thoroughly explained, had he read the *entire* work “heavily” (as opposed to his “very lightly”). So, what happens to a body for a period of time in the interval $0 < T < \infty$ is only of transient character and cosmologically unimportant. For rigid rods to have cosmological significance, it is necessary that they be of fixed size for all time, including the extremes of 0 and ∞ , which is impossible for *all* material bodies in this Universe.

On the comment on p.64: The *reasonableness* of my statement regarding the shape of the expanding Universe must be seen in light of the fact that under the law of expansion discussed, the Universe at $T = 0$ comprised a point of zero size in space, outside which point there was nothing to obstruct expansion and inside which point, at $T = 0$, there appeared copious numbers of *similar* particles (the photons that *still* make up the First Light), which the reader finds discussed in Sect. 2.3.2.2, spreading off in *all* directions. To a reader unfamiliar with my text in its entirety, some statements may on a first reading appear odd. Their reasonableness and inner logic perhaps only gradually will sink in when the reader, having read all the text, sits down to think back. As for the motion in space of the Universe as a whole, all discussion is moot. To determine the existence or nonexistence of such motion one needs a *material* frame of reference *external* to the Universe, which *is* a contradiction in terms. The spherically symmetrical expansion of the Universe under conservation of momentum refers to the internal dynamics of the Universe as a whole. An additional translational through space motion of its center requires an additional “push” *different in kind* from the first one. Whereas Eq. 10 permits us to analyze the first kind of “push”, there is nothing at all we can use to make any statement whatever as to the second kind. As my work finally *amply demonstrates*, behind all physical phenomena comprising the subject matter of science, there was Reason. One thus must ask whether a plausible *reason* can be given for the Universe to be travelling as a whole through space towards nowhere at all! On finding no reason for such an undertaking, one must dismiss the possibility that Reason could have added this extra and seemingly unnecessary complexity. *Nothing* but *absolute* Economy must be seen behind it all.

As to the question asked about p.74, had the Reviewer read with even minimal care, he would have found the answer smack in the middle of that page, further detailed on the next, and discussed in the widest context in Sect. 3.6.

Finally, on the brief comment on Part Three: Based on his admission that

this part of my work is his “primary field of expertise”, the Reviewer *was reasonably expected to have recognized his obligation* not to spend, as he did (and for reasons nowhere explained), almost his entire time in other areas, on which it is natural to consider his opinions less than “expert”, a fact amply demonstrated by my complete refutation of his earlier, far-short-of-cogent comments, but *to concentrate his attention on this Part of my work* and tear it literally apart if truly found in any way deficient. He *was* expected to state that he had read this part of my work “very (or, extremely) carefully” and not just “fairly carefully”. If he truly found fault, *he had a professional obligation to indicate* where exactly, how and why. In view of my claims about my new physical model of the electron, *he had an obligation to show* how and why my claims were fraudulent, if they were. Instead, *he only asserts, but does not show*, that “there are too many misconceptions and/or errors ... to list”. We thus miss the light of his expertise. I do not say this sarcastically, for I truly would have treasured his expert comments, if they were valid. He limits himself to giving only “one small example”, relating to my perceived “trouble accepting ... a negative energy”. His comment reads more like a defense of the present positions and less like a rational analysis of my own, in which alone he was obligated to engage. I shall not deny theoreticians the right to imagine things and treat them as they please. Those are figments of their imaginations over which they are free to exercise their absolute prerogatives. *My obligation, as I saw it, was to explain the real quantum phenomena, subject to real and universally imposed constraints, in this real expanding Universe*, and not to submit my investigations to the unwarranted constraints and freedoms currently accepted or allowed. The notion of negative energy was introduced with the Bohr model of the electron. The subsequently developed quantum theory *was adjusted* to include the findings of Bohr, if not his model, since those findings agreed with the spectrum. As is already known, the “problem of infinities”, which I discussed briefly in my work with direct quotations from Dirac, is still an outstanding problem in quantum mechanics. Dirac himself did not consider the “renormalization procedure” (philosophically) adequate, except only in the very narrow approximate heuristic sense. The problem of negative energy (but not considered by this Reviewer as being a problem) is a direct consequence of the arbitrary assumptions of the Bohr model which placed the zero of energy of the electron at an infinite radius of revolution around the nucleus. In the face of knowledge in 1913, this placement in itself did not seem incorrect. But although the Bohr model has been abandoned as inadequate, the notion of negative energy remained, but has yet to be recognized, as this Reviewer demonstrates, as flying in the face of the expanding Universe!: Current theory accepts negative energies for all radii smaller than infinity and assigns positive energies to the conduction band that is “physically”(?) placed at beyond infinity! “My trouble” is that *all* this is sheer nonsense in a finite Universe. To state that

“There is nothing fundamental, either from a physical or a philosophical point of view, in this [current] choice” demonstrates how neglectful of philosophy this Reviewer (at least) is and proves that *the “experts” have yet to recognize the need to harmonize their theories to the constraints imposed by the Universe*. According to the “experts” the zero of energy, inextricably related to an infinite radius of revolution, is a physically acceptable choice, valid at all times, and this IS WRONG! How this choice can be “acceptable” even in a finite Universe, they have never bothered to explain!: If ionization truly obtains at an infinite radius, electricity ought to have remained unknown and unknowable! Don’t they understand this? Conventions that fly in the face of their own everyday tools are only good for laughter! In *this* expanding Universe of ours, presented in Part Two of my work, an infinite radius for the electron is physically permissible *only* at $T = \infty$. Then, not only the electron but the entire Universe also will both possess zero energy. This is a direct consequence of expansion relating directly to Newton’s Law of Gravitation under constant G and M . As a result, in this Universe, the point of zero energy is a physically given absolute limit, permissible only at $T = \infty$, and not a mere convention subject to arbitrary choice! In this Universe, the energy ranges from ∞ to 0, not from $-\infty$ to ∞ , as the “experts” have it! The question then arises whether to regard *uniformly all* energy in and of the Universe as ranging from ∞ to 0 or from $-\infty$ to 0. The first is the logical choice since everything that exists physically must naturally be assigned, due to the power of its very existence, a *positive* value. The physical absence of something *is only zero*, and thus, physically, nothing exists that can be assigned a negative sign, *in exactly the same way* that no temperature exists below absolute zero. That this is the only logical choice is immediately seen the very moment one recognizes the preeminence of *basic* Logic and physics in matters physical over the intrusion of abstract mathematical notions. One cannot properly employ mathematics to explain this real World without due consideration of its logical and physical limitations.

Thus even in this last “expert” comment on substance, I submit, it is not the author who is erring. He did not see his “new theories” in the abstract and independent of the constraints imposed by the Universe, as the “experts” have been doing up until now! Rather, he sought to harmonize ALL the evidence confronting us, which current theory has not even dreamed of doing! It is truly astounding that here I propose *a new model* of the electron physically free of *all* objections (as far as I can see), which furthermore liberates us from the Principle of Uncertainty and this “expert” Reviewer does not even acknowledge these facts, let alone discuss them, analyze or refute them if wrong!!! I most humbly submit that *this treatment of my material does not bespeak of intellectual honesty given true expertise, or of true expertise given intellectual honesty! One thing is clear: both cannot have been present*. Which of the two was missing, it is not for me to determine. I, only humbly, submit!

Dear Mr. Tennity, I have at long last exhausted my detailed refutation of the Reviewers' comments. Scripta manent! What I have written and what they have written is now open to examination and comparison. I never expected the proponents of the current theories to give up at once. It has never happened before. But I did expect them to raise some questions of real substance, and there are several that I can think of, none of which, however, I have found capable to invalidate the structure that I have built. Had that been the case, to continue further would have been futile. So, I believe I did not waste my time over the last twelve years. In my efforts to find fault with my own thesis, I went to extremes for which I have already been accused of being insuccinct, and I submitted my thesis to my own most relentless criticism, compared to which, the comments of the two Reviewers pale. In this present refutation, I deliberately exhausted every point in great detail, so that nobody can now say that I did not adequately explain myself, or that my positions are supposedly internally inconsistent. This Letter shows that they are not. Further, my reply shows the haste with which the first reviews of my work were conducted. Those two gentlemen to whom directly by mail and personally I submitted my work for review (whose names it will perhaps be prudent not to mention in this Letter, which is exclusively addressed to the comments of others) are obviously more conscious of their responsibilities and of the distinct possibility that all stones we throw at each other may return to hit us, and so, they take their good time to reply—if they do! A true expert should have no difficulty finding, quite easily, fault with my work—if it is faulty. That it takes these two gentlemen so long to respond, increasingly looks like being in direct proportion to the strength of my work. So, in the face of that delay, one can say that, they have a hard time disproving the general thrust of my work from which all else follows, contrary to the views expressed in the two reviews, which, I trust you will agree, I completely demolished.

It must also be said that if no objections (superior by far in quality to those already refuted) can be produced by the proponents of the current theories, it should be clear that this work represents a contribution to science and the philosophy of Reality of truly historic proportions. *I know*, this would be arrogant in the extreme for me to claim for my work without proof. For the moment, it looks as though the proof is supplied by the very poor quality of the objections raised by the two Reviewers against my work, and by their present complete refutation.

There is an immense structure of interest, personal and professional, as well as academic, and of reputations that have been built upon the presently held theories. Their proponents, therefore, are not likely to take kindly to challenges, specifically serious ones, that threaten to overthrow that structure. The suggestions by the two Reviewers that I should seek publication in the "journals", to me looks no more than a most flimsy attempt to defeat in "the antechambers of

science” the public appearance of this most important work, or at least to delay it for as long as they can. Other ostensibly important books have been published with a great deal less (and *far more suspect*) material than I have put together in this work. So, the suggestion of Reviewer #2 that you refrain from publication of this work cannot possibly be given any weight, except only as an attempt to protect those interests from a serious challenge, that alone can generate a “furor”. It is quite clear to all who have been pondering the state of science in the last, say, forty years, that the next great advance will indeed create a “furor”, if only because it will shake down everything that is not securely held in place. There can be no question that a serious challenge to the main theories of the day cannot naturally pass unnoticed. If their proponents feel sufficiently confident in them, they should not be fearful of the “furor”, and if they are not sufficiently confident, in which case their fears are well justified, their theories are perhaps not worth keeping. To me, increasingly, it looks as though “my theories” can only be overthrown along with the Law of Gravitation. And that is not an easy task!

I have prepared three addenda of great importance that must be included at the end of my work. They greatly enhance the strength of the work and further refute the current theories. Their subject matter did not quite fit the main body of the work. Their titles are “On the Geometry of Space and Time”, “On Position, Expansion and Containment” and “On Simultaneity”. Their total length is 36 pages. I expect to have them reviewed also.

I honestly do not know what you will decide to do with the evidence already in your front. I believe you would very much like to proceed with the publication. If so, and if the forthcoming *arguments* are no better in quality than those already refuted, you will have wasted precious time while the way is in fact clear for you to proceed. On the other hand, I do not know what is a reasonable time to wait for comments promised. The one of my Reviewers has already had the work for nearly two months, the other for nearly one. If you decide to wait for a while longer, I will be inclined to agree, for I truly value worthwhile comments and would like to consider them before publication. On the other hand, it *is* conceivable that the two gentlemen may not want to participate in the overthrow of current theories, in the building of which they themselves have participated, however much their overthrow may be needed before we advance further, as my work so amply shows. If so, perhaps, they will never send me their comments.

I will be obliged if you call to give me your opinion on all these matters, after you have an opportunity to absorb the contents of the present Letter.

Very sincerely,

12

**Re: QUESTIONS
ON QUALITY OF SUBMISSIONS**

(referred to in the previous article)

the answers to which, provided by the Reviewer,
this Author judges to be valuable to the Publisher.

A. Questions on Quality, Scope and Comprehensiveness.

01. Is this a serious piece of work?
02. Is it carefully, not hastily written?
03. Is it sufficiently well written and is it readable?
04. As an attempt to explain Reality, is this work partial and narrow?
05. Or, is it meticulously and to the greatest degree possible all-inclusive?

B. Question on Originality.

01. Is this an original piece of work, a true prototype?

C. Questions on its Logic.

01. Does this work employ a level-flat, the classical, most accessible form of Logic?
02. Does it apply its Logic consistently?
03. Are its premises logical?
04. Are its premises consistent with the Laws of Nature, the most powerful Law of Nature we know of, the Law of Gravitation?
05. Are the arguments logical and consistently applied?
06. Are the conclusions logically deduced?
07. Are the conclusions mutually consistent?

D. Questions on the Findings of this Work.

01. Does this work deliver on the promises and claims made in the Prospectus?
02. What are very briefly the findings of this work?
03. Are these findings already largely known?
04. Are they novel?

- 05. In what do they differ?
- 06. Are they in agreement with the general tenor of current principles and understanding?
- 06a. If not, could they honestly be called revolutionary?
- 07. As a contribution to the advancement of knowledge, are the findings of this work recognizedly, or potentially important?
- 08. Are they recognizedly or potentially correct?
- 08a. On the basis of what principles, those currently accepted, or those introduced in this work, is the answer given?
- 09. Are they likely to be proven correct?
- 09a. Any time soon, given our present capabilities, or perhaps later?
- 10. Are they likely to be accepted as correct, given their simplicity, pending later conclusive verification?
- 11. Are they valuable and deserving to become widely known and to be deeply examined and kept in mind, even if difficult to be “proven” as correct at the present time?
- 12. Are the dissemination and study of this work desirable as likely to deepen our understanding of Reality on the basis of current knowledge, if the findings of this work are ultimately to be shown incorrect; or on the basis of its own findings, if the latter are ultimately shown to be superior to current knowledge?
- 13. In the latter case, can it now, or will it in the future, be said that this work is seminal of a revolution in science and the philosophy of Nature and of Reality?

E. Questions on the Form of Presentation.

- 01. Is the material contained in this work sufficient to be presented in book form?
- 02. Is the interconnectedness of the material weak and thereby permitting the material to be scattered in “paper” form throughout the refereed journal literature?
- 03. Or, is it strong and the wholesomeness of view this work allows will be lost if the work is presented in such a form?
- 04. Are there specific compelling reasons why the material should be presented in “paper” form and not as a monograph?
- 04a. Is the latter form any less refereed than the former?
- 04b. If so, what does the present reviewer conceive his own function to be?
- 05. If this work stands logically together, why was it not presented before by some other author? Was this likely due to the up-to-now narrow, partial and compartmentalized approach to work traditionally taken, (when viewed) with an eye to expedient, competitive publication in refereed journals?
- 06. If so, will this work not be destroyed if split to suit the format, scope and the narrowness of conception imposed on the ordinary journal article?

07. If published as a monograph, is it not true that this work will be far more accessible as a whole to the interested public and therefore put to a far wider test than would be the case if submitted to the scrutiny of only two or three referees who alone normally pass on the acceptability of the ordinary journal article? And even if it should pass them and was thus scattered through the journals, would it still not be accessible except only through specialized libraries and the specific-journal subscribers?
08. Is it now the time to re-evaluate the state of science?
09. Do we not really need to begin reviewing our position on Reality if we have one (do we?) and do we not need to begin viewing Reality as a whole?
10. Is a from-the-roots-up re-examination of current precepts conducive to satisfying that need?
11. Is not the present work an attempt to provide a comprehensive view of Reality and is it not attempting to cast science in its proper position within that wider conception of Reality?
12. Is it not, then, logically necessary that this work be presented as a whole?

F. Questions on the Level, Extent and Sufficiency of this Review.

01. Is this review of this work by the present Reviewer of the same (or lower, or higher) standards than those employed in the screening of ordinary journal articles?
02. Is the level applied uniformly throughout, or is it restricted to the Reviewer's own particular field?
03. What percentage of the whole work does this review adequately cover?
04. Does the Reviewer consider his own review adequate. or does he feel that further review is needed?

G. Questions on Recommendations.

01. Is it the recommendation of this Reviewer to reject this work as totally worthless?
02. Is it his recommendation to attempt publication in a refereed journal?
03. In view of the comprehensiveness attempted in this work, is this recommendation not incommensurate with that comprehensiveness and in effect relegating to others the responsibility of the decision to allow or reject publication?
- 03a. If so, how does the present Reviewer feel about his having discharged his duties to the Publisher, the Author, Science, the Truth?
04. Is it the recommendation of this Reviewer to attempt publication in monograph form?
- 04a. Is this recommendation incompatible with the broadness of the scope of this work and, in effect, imposed by the need to consider Reality in its totality, to which need this work is its Author's honest attempt to offer an answer?

H. Qualifications to the Reviewer's Recommendation.

(Please, state).

I. Conditions (corrections, restatements, etc.) this Reviewer considers valuable (or even necessary) for the Author to provide in order further to improve the quality of this work.

(Please, state).

J. General Evaluation of the Marketability of this Work and of the Market.

(Please, state).

13

Re: SECOND RESPONSE TO PROFESSOR PAULING

Professor Linus C. Pauling,
L. Pauling Institute of Science & Medicine,
440 Page Mill Rd., Palo Alto, CA 94306

February 13, 1986.

Dear Professor Pauling,

Despite your evaluation of my manuscript, I would be beyond all bounds if I did not hasten to thank you for reading it page by page.

I just thought that my discovery of the law of gravitation, through the dimensional argument under constant G and M , leading to the possibility of an inexorable connection to universal expansion was a major insight. I just thought it was important to find out where that led. I just thought that that connection of gravitation and expansion leading to an absolute point of reference and a decreasing speed of light in contravention to relativity theory and the logically necessary rejection of the latter in view of the universality of the former was major scientific news. I just thought that my re-examination of the Michelson-Morley experiment proving the inappropriateness of relativity as an explanation of its null result should be made widely known. I just thought that the expansion of the Universe belying our current notion of length as an independent variable of the physical world was indeed a very major discovery. I just thought that the systematic variation of our clocks due to the ageing of the Universe was another major discovery that also deserved to be widely known. I just thought that showing how most of the so-called constants are in fact dependent on the age of the Universe was a major discovery. I just thought that my explanation of the night sky, despite the variation of density with the radius r , would finally put to rest that and other age-old questions. I just thought that the laser measurements of the increasing Earth-Moon distance fully prove the validity of my insight and independent theoretical findings. I just thought that all these flowing without inconsistency from Newton's Law and pointing to an altogether amazing inner Logic truly independent of all human supposition was an extremely important finding that should affect radically both our science and philosophy. Obviously, you do not find any of these interesting. I, will keep on respecting you.

I also thought that my physical model of the electron, eliminating all shortcomings of the Bohr model, only physical model so far known, deserved to be-

come widely known. I also thought that my model of the electron, being compatible with the expanding Universe, doing away with the physically forbidden negative energies, resolving the problem of infinities, supplying values for the various properties of the electron, explaining the spectrum with just one quantum number instead of the current four, was something that the scientific community would very much like to know about. I just thought that the totally unforced application of the model to the helium atom, requiring only two quantum numbers instead of the usual eight was indeed a significant simplification. I just thought that all these, constituting in effect the triumphant return of certainty to quantum phenomena and demanding a re-examination of our understanding of the Heisenberg relationship was something that would be found most important by most thinkers and philosophers. Obviously, you do not find any of these to be of real value.

I also thought that there is nothing confusing about the notion of a spherically symmetrically oscillating spring. I also thought that there is absolutely no arbitrariness whatever in dimensionally equating the action of the spring to the otherwise given action "constant" h , subject to a dimensionless proportionality constant n . I also thought that the logically reached conclusions regarding a unified energy scale common to all phenomena, controlled by a universally and identically imposed unit of action, deserved proper attention. I also thought that the logically deduced conclusions regarding the mass and size of the fundamental particle that unifies the worlds of the very small and the very large was, and is, just what people have been looking for in connection with the inner consistency of the physical world. Obviously, here too, you disagree.

Finally, I just thought that, the universal laws I thought I discovered demanded a Logical examination as to their proper place in the Scheme of Things. I just thought that the Laws of gravitation, of the variability of the velocity of light, of the constancy of G and M , which I demonstrated as imposed from the Outside upon the fundamental particles, was a finding of truly profound significance. I also thought that the independent existence, and my demonstration of it, of free will in a Universe so absolutely tightly controlled by externally imposed Law would be of fundamental interest to all educated people. I also thought that the free will being an attribute of persons existing in this world of senseless physical particles, persons capable of recognizing the Author of those Laws and the Creator of this physical world as another, *the*, Person, was the bridge that would finally span the abysmal chasm that for centuries now has separated science and religion. I just thought that that chasm must be bridged before a measure of true sanity can return to this world of ours where both religion and science have been reduced to mere profiteering gimmicks to fool the gullible public. I just thought that scientists, after taking a full measure of the true significance of their pursuits, would finally come to realizing that they had an obliga-

tion to begin constructing that bridge from their side of the chasm. Obviously, none of these you find to be of interest, let alone of true value.

I have no illusions that my work would put me in utmost peril in atheistic Soviet Union. I was having a dim hope that my concerns were of value in our “free” world. If our world is just as atheistic as theirs, but here my work is deemed as uninteresting whereas there it would be regarded as high treason, I wonder, can this distinction be more than merely cosmetic and transparently superficial?

I have grown of age always paying my respects to my elders. Besides my respect, I have grown to admire you over the years. You may feel assured that my admiration for you will not grow dimmer.

Your response leaves me to conclude that my manuscript is totally worthless to you. Because it is of value to me, I will be indebted to you, if you arrange to have it returned to me. My enclosed check for \$7.00 should cover the postage (Certified Mail, please). Any additional expense, should there be any, will be paid upon delivery.

In view of your forthcoming birthday, please, allow me to extend my best wishes for a healthy, long and fruitful life.

Very respectfully,

THIS AUTHOR’S IMMEDIATE COMMENT: Professor Linus Pauling simply constrained himself to no further comment and returned my check unused along with my manuscript. The Reader can now draw his own conclusions.

THIS AUTHOR’S GENERAL COMMENTS: It was *not* my intention, while impliedly critical, to hit Prof. Pauling in the soft part of his soul by exhibiting what some may take as an obvious effort of purely false servility. Those who have followed his lectures, the manner he expresses himself, his struggle even at advanced age to cope with problems we all face, have surely seen his whole spirituality. It was to this that I was appealing, that it begin considering the *complete picture* before us.

The World, the Universe, the Cosmos (the ancient words used to have meanings that we now ignore to our pitiful spiritual impoverishment) may *not* be cut off to compartments, so that one may claim great expertise in one of its fields and total lack of interest in all others. The metaphysical questions arise exactly because the physical answers we so provide do *not* satisfy us. It is pitiful in the extreme that the Cosmos has been cut off to “Science”, “Philosophy” and “Religion”, that as time goes on are in ever lesser speaking terms! It is *not* just

only “Britannia” that divides in order that she may more effectively rule to her own advantage!: It is *evil* itself! Science is *not* just mere devising complex *ad hoc* mathematical theories in order to “predict” *ex post facto* our practical measurements, which is exactly what the current quantum mechanics does! Philosophy is *not* mere abstract word-play meant to impress the ignoramuses! Religion is *not* devising a collection of dogmas untested as to whether they truly glorify or rather profane the Most High, before which one may play the unconcerned party!

When the microscope reveals life unseen to the naked eye, based on molecules and on atoms and ultimately on the true Democritean atoms; when the electron microscope reveals grains of fuzzy yet *non*-collapsing mass (*contrary* to electromagnetic theory) of size about 10^{-7} cm, rather than *empty space*, as we have no instruments capable of seeing anything down to 10^{-13} cm or below (which is the *claimed* size of electrons and protons, that we pretend we “see” in “probability space”), then we are not talking of Science but of “Science”, not of Ἐπιστήμη as there is nothing on which ἐφιστάμεθα, but of “Ἐπιστήμη” which is nothing more than a collection of another kind of dogmas!

The electrons fail to collapse on the nucleus not because a made up mathematical theory wants them not to collapse but because they do not collapse on their own, totally unaware of our mental constructions! It is the inner structure of electron and nucleus and of the complete atom that prevents it from collapsing; but to think in such honest terms has been forbidden by the prohibition of talking about the so-called “hidden parameters”, about which the current theories are completely unable to utter a single word of common sense, thus leading us unnecessarily that much faster to metaphysics, which must only be faced *after the complete evidence of all three Science, Philosophy and Religion is at hand* having presented the *best Logical arguments for the Whole* of each, *not as is still now done* as their *disparate* dogmas!

Presented to us for our complete edification is the entire complete Cosmos, not just what each of us can myopically see before his own nose! How *hesitant*ly the notion of action was introduced by Planck is too well known to need repetition. How *arbitrarily* it was introduced by Bohr, too! The electron covers *physically uniformly* the proton *around all four steradians* of space. If it does so while remaining motionless, we may *not* speak of action! But if it vibrates (*obviously* about a certain radius) *immediately* the notion of action enters the picture, *not arbitrarily but as a concrete natural fact*, and we are obliged to consider it as best we can. This *is* physics, only seemingly “complicated”, yet leading to the simplest possible structure of all atoms, which the current quantum theory stubbornly *refuses and forbids to consider*, which is *not* Science but yet another *cryptoreligious* dogma!

We *must* be honest: Are we prepared to see the Universe in its *entirety*,

from its very beginning at its initial age of zero, held together by gravitation yet still at the same time expanding under constant G and M, *structured*, i.e., *engineered to its utmost retail*, or are we not? If we are, I challenge everyone to tell the world what is wrong with using the dimensional analysis (that *every* self-respecting engineer uses in order to avoid disaster!) of Newton's Law of gravitation! If we are not, the "scientists", "philosophers" and "religionists" whom we honor are *not* honest, as they are unwilling to confess the presence of the Engineer, the Demiurge, Who is *not just a mathematician* (as per Einstein!) scribbling meaningless symbols leading to no solid conclusion about anything, nor is He somebody playing with empty words, nor is He somebody setting down a list of spurious dogmas, but He is *just Perfect in every conceivable Good, Honest, Honorable aspect!*

As such, how do we dare categorize Him with things that are *not* like Him perfect, things that imply for their being a prior cause? God presents a problem only when we see Him as Himself also being in need of a prior cause. But doing so, we mutely call Him *imperfect*, as Perfection needs no prior cause of Her own!

Let us at last understand just this much: We are *not*, despite all our claims to the contrary, either "good" scientists, or "good" philosophers, or "good" theologians, unless we *truly are good in all three!* It is this lack of goodness that our vanity so stubbornly refuses to recognize, that inhibits our personal Spirituality, *not* our so-called "spirituality", from coming to full bloom! Simple people, taught to mind their little personal "business" are left to admire the "leaders", leading them to what neither "leaders" nor led know to be *evil* for its *stubborn unwillingness* to consider Perfection and her ultimate Purpose!

14

Re: THE LAST LETTER TO MR. TENNITY

Mr. Kenneth Tennity,
Science Editor,
Prentice-Hall, Inc.,
643A Tremont St.,
P.O.Box 5,
Boston, MA 02118

March 10, 1986.

Dear Mr. Tennity,

I am at long last in a position to send you all additional comments made by two more Reviewers of my manuscript "PRINCIPIA PHYSICA UNIVERSI".

As you are already aware, one of these Reviewers was Prof. Linus Pauling. Enclosed herewith, please, find copies of my complete correspondence with him, consisting of my three letters of Nov. 11 and Dec. 1 1985 and Feb. 13 1986, and of his two letters of Nov. 20 1985 and Feb. 3 1986.

The other Reviewer was Prof. of physics John Ollom of Drew University. I met with him on three separate dates:

(a) On Jan. 7 1986, for about 1/2-hour, when I handed him a copy of the manuscript and introduced him to the main ideas that I tackled there.

(b) On Feb. 12 1986, for 3 1/2 hours, which we spent discussing but not exhausting details of my manuscript. On that occasion, I handed Prof. Ollom

(i) copies of the three Addenda that I mentioned in my letter to you of Feb. 3 1986;

(ii) the file of my correspondence, up to that date, with Prof. Pauling;

(iii) your letter of Jan. 22 1986 with the thereon attached comments of the two anonymous (to me) Reviewers;

and (iv) my file copy of my letter to you of Feb. 3 1986, along with a copy of the questionnaire attached thereon. (I thought it important that I provide Prof. Ollom with *all* this material for him to form the most comprehensive opinion on the subject of my manuscript and the circumstances surrounding it.)

In this way, however, I was unable to send you any material in the interim. I wrote my Feb. 13 1986 letter to Prof. Pauling having in mind his Feb. 3 letter which arrived on Feb. 11. [As I prepare this material for this presentation, I must say that I do not recall whether I handed Prof. Ollom a copy of Prof. Pauling's letter that had arrived on the previous day, my answer to which I wrote on Feb. 13.]

(c) On March 6 1986, for 2 1/2 hours, when we continued the discussion adjourned on Feb. 12.

On Feb. 12, I requested of Prof. Ollom that he dictate his comments and/or thoughts on my work to his secretary and to try to reply to as much of the questionnaire as he could, so that I might have something concrete to send you from him also. On my asking him about it on March 6, he replied he had not realized that I had wanted his comments in writing and that he had prepared nothing. He offered, however, to comment on my manuscript to you if you would be willing to call him, either at Drew or at home after 7.30 pm (phone numbers withheld on preparing this material for publication).

As regards Prof. Pauling's comments of Feb. 3, I must make the following comments: I am sure you also will be disappointed, as I was, to find that he, too, equivocated with his statement "... I may, of course, have missed some point. If you have made a discovery of this sort, ..." in his second paragraph and his closing restatement "... It may be, of course, that there is such a point, or even more than one, in the manuscript, but I did not find any". My views on equivocation I stated in my letter to you of Feb. 3; they need not be repeated here. I am deeply grieved that they apply to this case also.

His skepticism expressed on par.3 of his same letter can only have been based on my introductory Section 1.1 (and not on my most detailed Section 2.3.2.8 which is thus being overlooked), a subject which I also dealt with in my letter to you of Feb.3. I will not repeat myself here.

His comments on my discussion of the hydrogen and helium atoms deserve detailed rebuttal. First of all, I would like to draw your attention, Mr. Tennity, to the fact that Prof. Pauling could not find *any* errors (which also applies to the entire work, for had it been otherwise he would have stated so)! He could only state "... seems to me to be unnecessarily confusing with the arbitrary introduction of a force restoring the electron to its average distance from the nucleus". As any competent physicist can assure you, there is nothing arbitrary in the theory of vibrating springs, *nor* in the way that I have used it in this regard: As long as a vibrating spring does not somehow dissipate its energy, or receive more energy, it will keep on vibrating in the same mode. Thus, not only is my use of the spring model not at all arbitrary, but it also removes the *very arbitrariness* of the notion of "stationary" states which were a priori introduced by Bohr in 1913, to account for the fact that the electron failed to spiral inwards as was demanded of it on the basis of the electromagnetic theory. That introduction by Bohr has since been accepted as a revolutionary advance in modern science. According to my treatment, one *need not introduce a priori* such "stationary" states. Despite Prof. Pauling's statement (same paragraph): "you introduce the quantum theory in your discussion in a rather arbitrary way by introducing the quantity h ", again, any competent physicist and logician can assure you that there is absolutely nothing arbitrary in my equating the action of the spring to the already known (from the work of Planck) action constant h multiplied by a

dimensionless proportionality constant n (Eq. 199). As I indicate in the footnote to that page, one *need not* assume that n comes in whole numbers. My wave number equation (Eq. 207) and its identity with the experimentally known Rydberg equation (Eq. 182) assures the whole-number values of n . In this way, no quantum theory is introduced a priori (which remains a somewhat vexing point to this day), as was done by Bohr. Rather, Nature *proves itself to obey a quantal law!!!* The quantum notions are thus shown not at all to be man-made; *they are natural!* This is a most profound difference in significance. There remains the important issue of π which Prof. Pauling does not mention by name, but which undoubtedly must have contributed to his perception of “unnecessarily confusing”. In the Bohr model, π comes in on account of the assumption of circular motion of the electron around the nucleus, and has remained in current quantum theory in the notions of angular momentum and spin. Without a circular motion or spin, π must be introduced in a *physically acceptable* manner. The great shortcomings of the Bohr model, which I discussed in Section 3.1 and again on p.177 [of the electronic edition], demonstrate that π is not introduced there in a physically acceptable manner. My demonstration in pages 178-181 [of the electronic edition] proves how π enters most naturally by consideration of the average velocity of the vibrating electron. Thus my model succeeds in a *classical way* to remove all arbitrariness and shortcomings of the Bohr conception and to prove that the quantal behavior of the electron and its understanding do not depend on arbitrary human suppositions as a prioristically introduced by Bohr. Thus despite Prof. Pauling’s decidedly soft statement “I think that I have to say that I can see no justification for your treatment of the hydrogen atom”, my treatment of it is physically fully justified with no arbitrariness whatever and no logical shortcomings!!! In contradistinction, the current quantum theory of the hydrogen atom based on the Schrödinger wave function is “normalized” (that is, specifically adjusted with a great deal of mathematical labor that depends on the a priori quantum notion without which no solutions of the wave function can result) to give the result of the physically objectionable Bohr conception. Without the Bohr theory, such normalization could not be applied. The current far more complicated mathematical treatment cannot compare with the extreme physical and [intrinsic] mathematical simplicity [*seeming* confusing on account of *the fact that in needs to take into account all the physical and geometrical characteristics of the case*—the two brackets added now for total clarity] of my treatment.

The same can be said of my treatment of the helium atom. Prof. Pauling could only state “with the aid of computers, it is now possible to calculate the energy levels of the helium atom ...”. The use of computers is indispensable in current quantum theory because, as is currently claimed (see: Eggers, Gregory, Halsey, Rabinovitch: Physical Chemistry, J. Wiley, 1964), “the (energy) levels

are not given, in general, by an algebraic formula, simple or otherwise". How wrong this perception is, it is demonstrated by my extremely simple Eq. 261 (p.203) [in the electronic edition] which does indeed give the energy levels of the helium atom. My subsequent derivation of the expression for the energy levels of the lithium atom (which I intend to include in the work as an addendum) constitutes the complete refutation of the current views. In juxtaposition to the use of today's powerful computers, I only used a hand-held Texas Instruments TI59 calculator and came *nowhere near* challenging the capabilities of that machine!

Please, note that Prof. Pauling avoided all comment on the multiple benefits accruing from my treatment and rather sought to argue in defense of the present theory!

In my reply to him (of Feb.13), I took advantage of his "go(ing) through your manuscript page by page" and his twice repeated (as already indicated) statement that he "may, of course, have missed some point" and "..., or even more than one" to indicate, each introduced with the deliberately tiresome incantation "I just thought that", at least twenty six points far more than simply "interesting", hoping to elicit some additional detailed comment. He returned my manuscript (with my unused check attached) with the mail of Feb. 18, but no comment whatever. I have since received no other reply and I no longer expect any.

His failure to find fault in my work and his subsequent silence, I believe, speak for themselves. He fully realized that any kind word he could utter on behalf of my work would in effect be license to print. We are thus forced to conclude that he chose not to utter such a word for reasons that we can only guess at: The objective student of his two letters will be at a loss to explain his statement (in the Nov. 20 letter) "I have read your letter with interest" and his subsequent reversal that he could not find "anything interesting" in my *entire* work which he read "page by page" and upon only a small part of which my letter of Nov. 11 was based. I believe I break no rules of logic if I deduce, Mr. Tennity, that he chose the stratagem of reversal, equivocation, implied denigration and silence only to defend the currently held philosophical [under the *seeming* "scientific"—bracket added now] positions, which can only be based on the current quantum theory which allows the notion that "God plays dice" and which no longer can be reconciled with the complete thesis that I advance. His skepticism on the matter of "pure blind chance" vs. God and his clearly seen atheistic inclination shown in the second paragraph of his Nov. 20 letter, probably provides the light in which his response to my work must be seen. I chose to send him the entire manuscript and I insist to have it published in its entirety under a single cover in order to show how tightly a *correct* philosophy of the World and Science go hand-in-hand. A philosophically disinterested scientist feels obliged first to examine the science in my work and only later to pass on the value of my phi-

losophy. If he cannot fault the science in my work his response cannot be “I already have one ‘working’ theory, I need no other”, which is Prof. Pauling’s clearly defensive stance on behalf of the current quantum theory. Indeed, to a committed scientist, it must be thrilling to find that there can be a competing theory that he cannot fault. If not so, his professed cool scientific objectivity and his promise to follow his researches wherever logic and nature lead must both be questioned.

Without written comments from Prof. Ollom, all that I can say will necessarily be my evaluation of his oral reaction. In 6^{1/2} hours of discussion with him, we fully agreed on the limitations and shortcomings of the current theories and on the points of difference between them and the thesis that I advance. Prof. Ollom indicated explicitly to me that my work is revolutionary, challenges the current theories from end to end and leaves them no room on which to stand. He predicted resistance by the proponents of the current theories who will feel their reputations threatened. He mentioned T.Kuhn’s neoclassic work “The Structure of Scientific Revolutions” and agreed with that author on the fact that a new “paradigm” does not entirely get established until *after* the demise of the proponents of the old. [After so many years, and as new generations of scientists are being indoctrinated and build carriers on the established theories, their proponents surely bet on their *faulty theories’ continued support* by generations of newer scientists whose reputation is *also* similarly threatened!—Comment now added for this publication.] He attributed this reaction to the “conservatism” of the scientific establishment, and their acceptance of a new theory, conditional on the possibilities it allows for experimental verification, in which they themselves can contribute. On the latter score, my thesis will challenge the very best that current experimental technology can offer. He, too, was unable to find fault anywhere in my work, except for a few oversights in typing.

I left a copy of my questionnaire (attached to my last letter to you) with him, so perhaps you will be able to elicit more comments from him, if you should call him.

Mr. Tennity, you now have as much as you are probably likely to get out of what you need to know as to the quality of this work. A manuscript so described by Prof. Ollom is not likely to be allowed publication by the establishment if the latter is allowed to exercise its veto power even when it cannot fault an opposing point of view. On my part, I did my level best to prepare this work, on which I labored unstintingly for twelve years, and to refute all objections against it. I hereby also keep my promise to send you all comments I was able to collect regardless of how I liked them. This work and its significance is too important for science and for humanity, for me to let it be compromised by anything short of absolute truthfulness, or lack of courage on my part, or by association with institutions of dubious scientific rigor. Nevertheless, I do not mind ad-

mitting that it is emotionally draining of me to have to defend what should be obvious to the objective reader.

The final question thus is how you as a publisher will judge the publishability of this work. On this matter I will appreciate your expedited final decision. I do very much hope you will decide in favor of publication of this most important work. If you should decide against it, I do not see how I can start all over again with another publisher. I will see what I can do to publish it on my own, whatever the cost. I hope your decision to publish this work will save me from this last resort, that, quite honestly, I am not even sure whether I can afford.

Very sincerely,

P.S. My conversation with Prof. Ollom showed me the need to prepare two additional addenda that I have already typed on "The Resolution of the Problem of Uncertainty" and "The Resolution of the Particle-Wave Duality Paradox", (the addendum "The Electrons in the Lithium Atom", mentioned earlier in this letter, remains to be typed), and an "Author's Foreword" to introduce the reader more smoothly to this revolutionary work for which modern science has not quite prepared him.

Addendum VI has been typed now and is sent along (March 14, 1986).

AUTHOR'S PRESENT COMMENT NOW ADDED:

This concluded my communication in writing with Mr. Tennity. He continued his efforts in a long trip he undertook along the entire West Coast. On his return he was kind enough to report his failure to find anyone interested in the project of examining my material and offering his opinion. For his determined effort, I can only have the highest regard possible. It was with great regret that he told me that given the resistance he met, he could no longer proceed with a proposal to publish submitted to his corporate superiors.

The "establishment" do have and wield the means of forcing publishers to keep the line: They simply cease to recommend to their thousands of students all

over the world all the books a “disobedient” publisher puts in print! That “reviewers” still keep their anonymity, totally unashamed of thus continuing the Grand Inquisition “tradition” of the Middle Ages, is a stigma that badly mars even this new twenty first century! They simply do not care! To paraphrase von Bismarck, “Ein zwei Professoren und die *Welt ist verloren*”! They never “foresee” anything!

Given the speed with which news of developments in the field of physics runs in the corridors closed to outsiders, and my efforts to approach professors everywhere, and issue the Press Release/Public Statement, it does not now appear odd to me that I dug my own tomb as it were! They already knew the “enemy”! They only did not foresee and have badly underestimated the obstinacy of this “enemy”! The Ages of the Universe are still ticking, and do tell the story *die Professoren* keep on suppressing!

15

Re: FIRST LETTER TO DR. GAVALAS

Dr. George R. Gavalas
3439 N. Marengo
Altadena, CA 91001

March 26, 1986.

Dear George,

I am sure you will be very much surprised to receive this letter after so many-many years. I hope both you and your family are well. My wife and I have been in the USA since 1969!

I came upon your name quite by accident, as I was looking up the faculty lists of universities on the West Coast in search of competent AND objective persons to review an important manuscript that I have written. The trouble is that the work is not in my "field"! You see, we have divided knowledge into fields, "ours" and "theirs", and are very envious and suspicious of "trespassers"! "It is to be expected" that, our reaction will be even more violent when an "outsider" comes to challenge our established notions, which is the case of my work! Of course, knowledge that does not know its own limits *and* internal connections and is, therefore, incapable of humility is not true knowledge, but how many philosophers are really left in the world today to guide us all?

But perhaps, in order to explain it all to you, I should start from the beginning! Despite a silly reaction (by Prof. Mousoulos) against my receiving a Niarchos scholarship in 1960, which I won while still in the army, I succeeded to re-win it the next year and left Athens for Sheffield in 1961. I got my M.Sc. in 1963 and a UKAEA scholarship to continue at Imperial College, London. The problem, the study of the thermodynamics of sodium-oxygen solutions, relating to the development of liquid-metal-cooled fast breeder reactors (LMFBRs), was then extraordinarily difficult and it took four years for me to collect enough material for my thesis. I got my Ph.D. (and DIC, no additional requirements for those getting higher degrees). In 1967 and returned to Athens, where I could find nothing worth the while. In 1968, I went to Toronto as a postdoc. but I did not quite complete a year there because in the meantime my visa was approved and went to the Argonne Nat. Lab. to continue and complete, finally, the work started in London. I stayed at ANL for 2¹/₂ years, half of which time was wasted chasing after the impossible."We" (Americans) knew better(!) than "they" (Brit-

ish)! [Actually the final method of the experimental setup was purely mine!] So, my proposal for solving the problem was overridden! After more than a year and much unhappiness, the “boss” finally agreed to let me try *my* (the “British”, or “European”) way and the problem was solved without a hitch! Did he admit his mistake to the Director? Hell, No!

So, in the end of 1971, I left ANL to join ASARCO, Inc. in their Research Dept. I had been a high temperatures man all along. What did they ask me to do?: Study hydrometallurgical problems relating to the electrodeposition of copper, zinc etc.! I did not mind it; it gave me an opportunity to learn (of course, on my own) more! But how is that for corporate efficiency? Simultaneously but on the side and at my own insistence, I proposed and I worked on high temperature problems as well, and eventually I developed a completely new, non-polluting, reactant-regenerative process for the direct reduction of PbS concentrates and two more processes, one for the non-electrolytic production of electrolytic-quality copper and the other for a fully rationalized beneficiation of slimes from copper refineries, both non-polluting. What did they do with these (and other worthwhile) ideas they spent so much money on? Exactly, nothing! When it came to renovating, the company proved to be disastrously conservative. The story of the metallurgical industry (especially the non-ferrous) in the USA does not have to be repeated here. The balance sheets and the stock-market tell it much more objectively.

What sustained me all these years, starting in 1974, was a theoretical discovery of truly fundamental significance, on which I worked on my own at night. I was able to work on it full time since Jan.1985 and is now finished in manuscript form (464 pages, about 160000 words, about 700 equations – 290 of them numbered – 21 figures, 18 tables). Being fundamental, i.e., pertaining to “physics”, which physicists have arrogated to themselves, the area is ipso facto “outside” my expertise! So, my publication proposals to a large number of university presses (I did not write to them all and Caltech was not one of them) and commercial publishers have so far gotten not too far. My deliberately brief description of only some of the findings, in the proposal, seems to have been seen by the “experts” as outlandish! Still, Pergamon Press did accept the manuscript but declined to pursue the subject further, not on account of the quality of the work which they could not impeach as no one has to date, but on account of their evaluation of the market (500 to 600 copies at \$75 to \$90 per copy), which was substantially below their minimum (1000 copies). Prentice-Hall also accepted the work and sent it out for review, but the (two) reviewers’ comments I was able to demolish and the editor (Mr. Kenneth Tennity) was persuaded that the work needed to be reviewed by truly competent AND objective reviewers. At present, he is travelling along the West Coast and has taken the work with him, in hopes of finding such persons. When he told me of his plans, I did not make

the connection with Caltech. On my own I wrote to my ex-boss at ANL and to Prof. Terzian (Astronomy, Cornell) requesting them to find me Nobel laureates willing to review the work. They did not. I wrote to six such persons (Bethe, he declined; Penzias, he referred me to Segal at MIT; Chandrasekhar, Cronin, R.W. Wilson, they all ignored me; Pauling, he accepted to review it!).

My more detailed letters were to Terzian and Pauling. My letter to Terzian was detailed all right but not revealing the crucial points. I wanted to excite his interest, but I did not offer him the book for review. This may have been a tactical mistake on my part because it is very likely that he took it rather personally. He is a well known astronomer and astronomers do not get Nobels for their astronomical discoveries. I was looking for reviewers at still “higher” levels! He suggested that I break up the work and send papers to journals. Now, one may exhaust one limited idea in a few pages and send it off. But this was a book of a different kind, where I patiently sought to exhaust as far as possible the implications of the original idea. When that was done, I had in my hands a complete thesis (not a “thesis”), a researchbook, not a textbook. One, in his right mind does not break up such a book, especially when it is truly holistic in approach, scientific *and* philosophical *and* “theological”! And I insist on having it published whole!

To Pauling I gave from the beginning some meat to chew on. For your benefit, George, I enclose copies of all my correspondence with him. Please, note his opening statement and his double skepticism (2nd and 4th paragraphs) as well as his “lack of background and interest” in matters metaphysical and cosmological, expressed in his Nov. 20 letter. It took him two months to reply and I almost thought that he would not. Now, in his Feb. 3 letter you can read for yourself his “go(ing) through (the) manuscript page by page”, his stated failure to find anything “interesting” (compare that to his “with interest” of his earlier letter, and ask yourself if one’s interest can be kept up enough to keep him going through a demanding manuscript page by page, that in the end can honestly be deemed and thus dismissed as “uninteresting”), notwithstanding his allowance (in effect self-extricating equivocation) for the possibility of his “hav(ing) missed some point” (second paragraph), which he felt forced to repeat even more amplified (“... or even more than one ...”) in his closing statement.

I replied to him with my letter of Feb. 13, where I deliberately used the tiresome repetition, the better to drive home the point of *his* “having gone through the manuscript page by page” and his having failed to regard the points thus listed as “interesting”! I do not know, George, whether you have kept up your interest in the basics, but I believe that, even if not so, your memory alone will inform you that these are not matters of inconsequential detail. This being the case, one must either prove me wrong, or think about all the consequences of his having to accept me as being right. Pauling failed to do the first and did not like the

consequences, especially because they *scientifically introduce the metaphysical!!!* This, it seems to me, is the crux of the matter, which in our modern atheistic times is “beyond the pale”!

Today, when faculties, specifically in the largest universities, make a living out of war appropriations and “star wars” projects, it is perhaps understandable for a young professor thus supported not to want to think along the lines that my approach forces upon us all. But for someone at the age of 85 to claim lack of interest in the metaphysical, it must be a demonstration either of absolute commitment to atheism, or of total incomprehension of what life and science are all about, despite acknowledged expertise and heaped honors! Perhaps, despite my living outside of Greece since 1961, where neither Socrates and Plato, nor Christ and Orthodoxy seem any longer capable of reaching (not that *they* failed, but only because the “modern” world no longer wants to consider matters of true everlasting significance), I must have remained a true Greek and a true Orthodox, irrevocably committed to the holistic view that there is a Reason and an Explanation for everything, which is what Orthodoxy is all about. Thus, I must be judging the world by quite different standards than it judges itself.

Pauling returned the manuscript; and the check, unused! But he had *not a single* word of comment. So, I must conclude, he did not really miss anything, he simply did not want to comment, and not for scientific reasons, which, if I was wrong, he only had to show! Finally attached to this letter is a section of my letter to Mr. Tennity where I comment on Pauling’s statements on my treatment of the hydrogen and helium atoms. It is this kind of reply, also provided to the two earlier pseudo-“reviews”, that persuaded this editor to pursue this matter further and seek objective reviewers.

I also had the work reviewed by J. Ollom, physics professor at Drew Univ., not too far from here, who was spoken on my behalf by a common acquaintance. He, too, could not find anything wrong but he acknowledged the revolution in thinking that my thesis implies and he predicted resistance in getting the work published. Although I asked him, he did not produce any written comments but promised to convey orally his views, if so asked. He said that he did not think he would be able to balance out, or reverse, a possible judgment based on Pauling’s comments. What he will say orally may just as well be equivocal and noncommittal as were Pauling’s comments and I will be unable to respond!

Thus the question boils down to whether an “expert” *objective* reviewer of very great reputation, whose word no editor can question or resist, can be found, who can prove me wrong on the basis of logic and physics, *not* on the basis of human supposition that we have long since stopped to see it as such and have taken it to be a “law of nature”, or failing that, who has the courage and the faith in his own judgment conscientiously to suggest that the book be published as is.

Is there such a person still to be found? Can you, George, solicit such a

person from among the faculty at Caltech or elsewhere? At this stage, I do not want to burden you with more details, nor by sending you the manuscript. I see no point in sending the manuscript, unless the reviewer meets the above specifications, otherwise it is a waste of time. Both Mr. Tennity and Mr. Hutchinson (publisher of Van Nostrand Reinhold) are rather discouraged at the general indifference of scientists and engineers, of which “only a relatively small handful are motivated to understand the underlying principles involved in their fields of study. This is unfortunate, but it is a fact”, in the exact words of the latter (he declined to accept the book because they are in a “transitional stage” and can only consider publications of “broad application rather than a more narrow and scholarly approach”). If that is so, then indeed our science has come to nought. I cannot believe it to be true; at least not quite yet!!!

What do you say, George?

Friendly,

16

Re: FIRST LETTER TO PROF. WIGNER

Professor Eugene Paul Wigner
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ 08544

June 29, 1986.

Dear Professor Wigner:

I am already grateful to you for agreeing to examine my manuscript despite your load.

It is a totally original piece of work, no part of which has been published. It also is sharply unconventional and indeed revolutionary. Because of this, I wanted to satisfy myself that I could make a complete, or near complete, thesis. I believe I have succeeded. My patience over the years to see this work through, its size and its every word show how very deeply I feel about the entire matter.

Since September 1985, I have tried to interest people in this manuscript. Perhaps, you will find the material on pages xiv-xvi of interest. The best recommendation I have gotten so far is to publish a series of articles. This I do not want to do, because my total objective in studying the subject matter and writing this long work can only be met through publication of the work as a book and cannot be met through publication of articles conforming to current limitations on length, style and content. I am looking for a person of great stature who unhesitatingly and with a clear conscience can sponsor this work. If I do not succeed in this effort, I am quite prepared to finance its publication on my own, knowing full well that I have to sell the house to do so. I cannot undertake this last sacrifice and still remain in this country where I have found myself jobless for the last nineteen months. From this point of view, the hour for me is already late.

I have decided to approach you for the sole reason that (as friends have advised me), you are very concerned and indeed unhappy with the near total disinterest fellow-scientists exhibit in meeting the clear logical demands placed on science. My work addresses that need and perhaps will meet your own criteria. In hopes that it does, I have decided to postpone initiating selling the house and moving overseas and to accept the extra sacrifice involved in waiting for your judgment under the possibility that in the end you will find it impossible to sponsor the book.

I understand fully your extreme dislike of attempts being made by others to use your name. I trust you will not put me along with them.

Where I am wrong, I expect to be proven so. But I also expect any points of weakness to be weighted against those of strength and not to be used as an excuse for rejection in the absence of such weighting. I expect an objective judgment, with which I shall do my best to comply, not a judgment that is already irrevocably committed to no longer supportable philosophical positions. I am fully aware that I ask for a very great deal, which inevitably will take time. Nevertheless and in view of my personal circumstances, which I feel obligated to disclose to you but which I request that they not be used in deciding the merits of my work, I wonder whether you can, in your wisdom, find it possible to issue an early preliminary judgment, pending a final decision later, that will help me in deciding my future.

I shall make myself available, should you find it necessary.

Respectfully,

17

Re: SECOND LETTER TO PROF. WIGNER

Professor Eugene P. Wigner
Princeton University
Princeton , NJ 08544

July 3, 1986.

Dear Professor Wigner:

I thank you for your letter of July 2 and understand your lack of time to go through my manuscript PRINCIPIA PHYSICA UNIVERSI.

As I explained to you in my letter of June 29, I must now proceed with the publication of the book on my own. I will indeed need the copy now in your hands for use in the manufacturing process.

Please advise your secretary to return it to me. I plan to call her directly on Monday, July 7.

Respectfully,

COMMENT: After calling Prof. Wigner's Secretary, I paid her a visit at the University and she handed me over both the manuscript and its cover letter that I sent to him along with it.

18

Re: FIRST LETTER TO DR. ROMER

Dr. Robert H. Romer
Book Reviews Editor
AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHYSICS
Amherst College
Amherst, MA 01002

December 11, 1986.

Dear Dr. Romer,

I will greatly appreciate your arranging to have my book PRINCIPIA PHYSICA UNIVERSI, a copy of which is enclosed herewith, reviewed at the earliest opportunity in the Book Reviews or some other appropriate section of your magazine.

The book speaks for itself. You will however be very interested in learning here that my almost-year-long efforts to have the book reviewed and recommended at the pre-publication stage were totally unsuccessful. This I can only attribute to the spirit of the book that must have been very unwelcomed in certain established quarters.

Given the complete originality of the book and the great importance of its scientific and philosophical findings, and the fact that I was forced to undertake personally the cost and care of its publication, I am determined to seek whatever avenues will permit the book to be brought quickly to the attention both of the scientific community and of the general public. Faceless reviewers shall not prevent my findings from reaching the readers. The time has come for whatever comments to be justified over one's public signature.

Failure to obtain reviews of my book in the scientific press will regretfully yet unavoidably force me to bring the matter up to the attention of the general press. I take it you will agree this should be avoided.

After your reviewing the book, I will be glad to donate the enclosed copy to the central library of your organization. I will appreciate your acknowledgment of this act. I have determined the price of the book at \$80.00 per copy. Handling and postage are extra.

Should you still decide not to review the book, I will appreciate your returning the enclosed copy to me in as "new" condition at my expense.

Very sincerely,

19

Re: EVOLUTION VS. CREATIONISM

The Honorable Harry A. Blackmun, Justice
United States Supreme Court
Supreme Court Building
1 First Street Washington, D.C. 20543

December 15, 1986.

Dear Mr. Justice,

What prompts this letter is yesterday's article in the New York Times on the case of "the constitutionality of a Louisiana law that bans the teaching of evolution unless 'balanced treatment' is given to 'creation science'", on which arguments were heard before the Supreme Court last week. The evolution vs. creation debate has occupied very much of the Courts time in recent years, but in a way "where we have not done well", as you are quoted in the above article to have said. Please, understand this letter to have been inspired solely on a "friend of the Court" basis.

It is indeed unfortunate that ever since its introduction more than a century ago, the theory of evolution has not been examined, by either side of this seemingly interminable debate, in the light of the most fundamental questions that the problem of the existence of the World, the Universe as a whole, poses both on Science and on Philosophy. The splintering of Science into rather tight specialist disciplines has prevented scientists from facing up to this problem in its totality. And the followers of "creationism" in fact adhere to a philosophically flawed position even in their own terms! It is ironic that the main organized religions are conspicuously absent from this debate. All parties seem either unable or even deliberately unwilling to raise themselves to the extreme rigors of the occasion.

The proposition that "God exists" is NOT without scientifically testable consequences. In rejecting the proposition, scientists are denying themselves the justification and opportunity to do some of the most beautiful science there is. On the other hand, the fundamentalists, by denying the philosophical questions that science introduces, in fact suspend themselves in mid-air. When the problem of the World is seen in its totality, the question of evolution vs. creation is in fact reduced to a question of SPECIAL creation of species, following the (problem of the) creation of the World as a whole. By thus insisting on the view that the various species were SPECIALLY created, the fundamentalists in fact deny God the right, or the ability, to have conceived of and executed a totally inclu-

sive Plan of Creation, in which special creation may be logically redundant! Logically, the question of special creation cannot be decided before the question of *the existence and total inclusiveness* of the Basic Plan is settled. Of course, it is to be viewed as lamentably childish of either side of the debate for each to support a position that *prejudges* the existence and inclusiveness of the Basic Plan and the *reasons* of God in devising it in the particular way in which He did, when the total problem of the World (whether it can exist on its own or whether it in fact requires that we consider its own creation in toto) is not even superficially examined! That either side seek the Court's opinion to support theirs is indicative of a state of mind that seeks to delimit philosophical thought by legislation and/or the approval of the highest Court. Unless, as a society, we take the view that the founding fathers of the Republic sought to delimit the philosophical pursuits of its citizens, the question of separation of Church and State must be viewed solely at the practical level of good neighborliness which in the founding fathers' mind should guide the citizens in a spirit of tolerance even DESPITE extreme differences of belief. In such a case, matters of basic importance are to be examined on a friendly basis by people seeking to establish the Truth in the face of the *total* evidence, and *not* in an adversarial manner before the Courts as is being done.

If religion in the widest sense is a way of life based on belief, and if belief is to be viewed as firmly held opinion on matters that cannot be proven beyond *any* doubt, then indeed not only the belief in the existence of God is religion, but *also* the opposite belief in the nonexistence of God! Thus in fact the Court is expected to decide on what is logically a dispute on the correctness of one religion or its opposite! And this despite the fact that neither side seeks to inform the Court on current developments on the basic problem of the World as a whole!

This basic problem is one that has occupied my thoughts in an organized manner for the past twelve years. My studies have now culminated in a book of 384 pages titled PRINCIPIA PHYSICA UNIVERSI that re-examines in the strictest scientific and philosophical manner the whole question of Objective Reality. My analysis shows that the problem can indeed be addressed in a totally rigorous manner above any intellectual suspicion. In the process of the analysis, basic generally accepted scientific positions are shown to be inadequately formulated or quite simply erroneous. My manuscript was completed sixteen months ago and I have since vigorously sought to have it competently reviewed and published. I have addressed a large number of university presses and commercial publishers, as well as individual professors of science including seven Nobel laureates. The reactions that I have received can only indicate that the reviewers find it hard to believe that a "non-specialist" can have an important fresh thought, or that they seek to protect the scientific establishment from the embarrassment of being it shown that scientific positions now held are in funda-

mental philosophical *and* scientific error. In view of this reception, I was forced to publish the book most recently at my own expense. In fact, only last week, I mailed copies of the book to the Libraries of Congress and the National Academy of Sciences, as well as to five scientific magazines (American Journal of Physics, Physics Today, Science, American Scientist and Fusion) for review. The book demonstrates most rigorously that the objective physical Reality can only be understood on the basis of Law that is *imposed upon* the fundamental particles of matter, Law that is shown to be impossible to have been introduced by the Universe as a whole, thereby requiring its introduction as a *separate* ingredient of physical reality from *outside* of the physical Universe and thus introducing directly to the problem of its Author. It is this finding and the general spirit of the book, I have come to believe, that the reviewers, so far, are negatively reacting to, as they have not addressed themselves to any scientific matter that would disprove the total thesis.

If you should find that this whole subject as here only most briefly presented is pertinent to the case now before the Court, I will be glad to send you a copy of my book. I shall leave it entirely to the Court to decide its value as scientific and philosophical evidence bearing on the case. As things now stand, I believe that, if objectivity still exists in the scientific world, it cannot be too long now before my book becomes the starting point for an *ab initio* re-examination of the most basic scientific and philosophical problems that we must finally face as a thinking society. As a concerned citizen, I find it to be my duty to bring this matter to the attention of the Court now, thereby helping preserve its very high esteem and saving it from what I believe will be another decision that otherwise will have been reached based on insufficient, incomplete and basically erroneous arguments. That so far I have sought to present my findings only through the established scientific outlets rather than through outlets of dubious scientific rigor, and only after they were complete, should, I hope, be sufficient evidence of the seriousness with which I have addressed the subject and am addressing this letter to you.

Sincerely,

Re: LETTER TO PROF. NEWTON

Dr. Roger Newton
Swain Hall
Dept. of Physics
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47401

January 8, 1987.

Dear Professor Newton,

Professor George Bistis, an old friend of mine and a forthcoming relative of yours, has suggested that I most definitely not fail to send you a copy of my book *PRINCIPIA PHYSICA UNIVERSI*. He is now going through a second reading of it and has indicated that he will be discussing the mathematical parts of it with a fellow-professor of theoretical chemistry and neighbor of his. I hope that you too will find the book very interesting.

Personally, I believe that a book of this unique kind has been crying out to be written for a very long time indeed. Philosophically, it points to a method of scientific attack that we have been at extreme pains to avoid imbued as we have become with the "enlightened" spirit of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Had Part Two of the book (at least, the dimensional analysis of G and the analysis of the Michelson-Morley experiment, to mention only two) been written before the turn of the century, and had the model of the electron developed in Part Three been about concurrent with the unrealistic Bohr model, there can be no doubt at all that not only the theoretical developments of this century but also the philosophical ones based on them would have been totally different. The reception that my book has so far received seems to indicate that, today, the reader must face a very awkward dilemma: To decide whether it pays to return to those three crucial points at least and start all over again, thus recognizing their basic importance in the proper development of thought but being forced to abandon a very great deal that has transpired during the last eighty years, or to pass the entire book in silence, thus endeavoring to avoid having to admit that we all have been barking up the wrong alley for so long. The reader must wonder whether it is possible at all that we have been so wrong for at least eighty years, and must

weigh the general repercussions of admitting it. But unless it can be shown that the logic and science of the book are totally wrong, which has not so far been shown, inescapably, even one moment's further delay in bringing the whole matter into the open becomes still harder to justify.

For my part, I have patiently endeavored to interest a large number of the most impeccable university presses and commercial publishers, scrupulously avoiding people of dubious scientific rigor, but to no avail. I was forced to publish the book on my own in Athens to save costs and thus bring at least the price of the book (\$80 per copy) within range despite the expected extremely limited market for it (perhaps only about 500 copies worldwide, or half of the market for a commercial publisher to have a go at it) as I was told by a very prominent international scientific publisher, which was the only reason that publisher could not undertake its publication. Since my return, just over a month ago, I sent, nearly a month ago, by insured mail, copies of the book for review to SCIENCE, PHYSICS TODAY, FUSION, AMER. JOURNAL OF PHYSICS and AMERICAN SCIENTIST, as well as to the Library of Congress and the National Academy of Sciences. So far, I have received not a single word of response. Perhaps, you can advise me whether or not this is normal! I tried for as long as I could to keep it within the scientific family here in the U.S. Then, I tried to interest a few people in Europe. So far, I have not sent copies of the book to reviewers overseas, but I wonder whether I am any longer well advised to avoid them. Moreover, as the time passes and I keep receiving dead or contrived silence, the idea of trying to interest the journalists becomes ever more tempting. I do very much hope that I will not have to resort to that. Perhaps, what is needed are people with established reputations, objective enough, disillusioned enough as to be iconoclastic, and courageous enough to support the book and force its public discussion.

The philosophical and religious implications of science cannot be avoided. Almost weekly nowadays, one reads more and more at least about the extreme mathematical improbability of it all to have come to pass purely by chance. That I, a non-"expert", was able to compose such a unique book has only been possible due to my willingness to see the World from the opposite perspective: that there has not been any chance at all, but only a Most Elegant Design! How very fruitful this approach has been is testified to by the book itself. But having started from such a view, I, logically, was forced to face up to questions currently regarded as beyond the pale of science. To have done otherwise would have been logically incomplete, to put it mildly. So, the courage that is needed for the book to be supported is the courage to face up to the entire Reality and not just to sci-

ence. Could it just be that so little of this kind of courage is to be found around nowadays? What a horrible thought to entertain! And yet, how else to explain the dead or contrived silence that I have been getting? Doubtless, after you have read the book, you will be in a position to comment. Perhaps also, to advise me on further action.

Very sincerely,

P.S. Publishing in a linguistically foreign country has its risks. What I found was that, I could get no editorial/proofreading help. I had to do it all by myself. A significant number of errors did manage to escape! I now have collected them in the sheet inserted at the end of the book. Most of them are insignificant. Only in very few cases could the meaning become difficult to grasp.

In the sheet, I have included some additional ideas on the Law of Separations, that I had too late to include in the text. I believe they are very important, because to resist the distinctness of the Law is logically insupportable, but also because to insist on a Euclidean straight-line path as one astronomer/reviewer has done in support of the current view is in fact to depend on a *metaphysical* knowledge of the value of the separation r in Eq.(1) in a Universe that cannot on its own physically define a Euclidean straight-line path!!! Whereas I do not exclude the logical *possibility* of it, as an option of the Lawgiver so to establish the Law of Gravitation, I still do not think that it must be admitted as the option chosen by Him, before exhausting the physically (naturally) realizable options. The option described in the Note is indeed similar but perhaps not identical to the one arrived at by general relativity, even instantaneously. For the moment, I see the instantaneous separation in an expanding Universe to be along the path light would have travelled with its instantaneously fixed velocity, a path imposed upon it by the masses at the three apices, the positions of which are also instantaneously fixed. In addition to these ideas, I have not discussed the issue of the background, necessarily changing in an expanding Universe, against which the planetary precession is measured. I take it that astronomers have ignored the thus required correction in arriving at the value of 43"/century for Mercury.

Just as I was writing the above last lines Dr. Romer's (Book Review Editor of the Amer. J. of Physics) of Amherst College reply arrived indicating, but giving no reason, that my book will not be reviewed in the Journal! My suspicions expressed in the second paragraph above thus seem to be verified once more!

21

Re: SECOND LETTER TO DR. ROMER

Dr. Robert H. Romer
Book Reviews Editor
AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHYSICS
Amherst College
Amherst, MA 01002

January 10, 1987.

Dear Pr. Romer,

Your decision not to review my book in the Amer. J. of Physics was very disappointing. Even more so was the fact that you deliberately chose to give no reasons for it.

As to the fate of the copy now in your hands, assuming that you practice no censorship of ideas, I take it you will not be adverse to my donating it to the main library of the College for permanent incorporation in its Reference Section under the following stipulations:

- (a) This letter, or a copy of it, be attached to the book.
- (b) The list of Errata and Note enclosed herewith also be attached to the book.
- (c) The Librarian announce the acquisition in the New Acquisitions Bulletin.
- (d) The Librarian inform me as to all above effects.
- (e) You return to me the enclosed check uncashed. Thus, there will be hope that some students will read the book and ask you to explain to them in class what exactly is in it that you object to and why, so that they can learn in this manner too.

In case you indeed practice censorship and are thus disagreeable on the above terms, please cash the check and return the book to me in good condition, so that I can send it to some other more agreeable reader. I take it that you, being a man of your convictions, will not mind of others being informed of this affair.

Sincerely yours,

P.S. It really was very painful to me to find that so many mistypings had escaped correction. I am forced to accept this as an additional price of publishing in a linguistically foreign land. Luckily, most of them are insignificant and only in very few cases could the meaning have become awkward to grasp. Perhaps, here too there is a moral to be found.

Re: LETTER TO DR. POUNCEY

Dr. Peter R. Pouncey, President
Amherst College
Amherst, MA 01002

February 2, 1987.

Dear Dr. Pouncey,

This is to inform you about and most strongly protest against the actions of Dr. Romer of your Physics Department and Book Review Editor for the Amer. J. of Physics.

I recently published a book of xx+364 pages called PRINCIPIA PHYSICA UNIVERSI of fundamental importance to science. If my findings as reported in my book are correct, their significance cannot be overestimated. On Dec. 15 1986, a copy of my book was delivered by insured mail to Dr. Romer at the College for review in the Journal. A copy of my cover letter of Dec. 11 is attached hereto. Dr. Romer replied by letter dated on Dec. 30 and stamped Jan. 5 and I responded on Jan. 10. Copies of these letters are also appended hereto. My book was returned to me by UPS on Jan. 27 without a single word of explanation.

A copy of my book with a similar cover letter was also sent for review in Physics Today, the monthly publication of the AIP. The people there took in fact an even worse stand: When on Jan. 29 I telephoned to determine progress, they admitted that they did not, and still do not, even plan to inform me by letter that they decided neither to publish a review on the book nor to list it in the "Books Received" list notwithstanding the fact that they did receive it, which they did not feel morally obliged to explain at all either in writing or even orally over the phone! I suspect that Dr. Romer also must have taken a similar decision as regards inclusion of my book in the "Books Received" list, but his exact position on this point, which for the moment is unclear to me, you can ascertain by calling him. I cannot help inferring, given the very close association of the member societies of AIP, that the treatment I and my book are receiving has been decided upon in common.

Because readers rely on the "Books Received" lists to be informed of new books in the field, and because there is a prima facie understanding that book reviews are reserved for the most important books received, especially those that are likely to have a major impact on the further development of ideas, the actions of Dr. Romer and the people at Physics Today can only be understood as a

deliberate effort to keep the readers uninformed of the very major development my book represents, even of the existence of my book! In this age, priding itself of freedom of information, the actions protested represent a most flagrant attempt at censorship of scientific ideas practiced by self-appointed people who have taken it upon themselves to “guide” (in effect, *misguide*) scientific and general thought along avenues exclusively of their own choosing. Their obviously concerted refusal to give reasons for their actions must in effect be considered as tantamount to their total inability to refute the logic and science of my book, for, I take it, nothing would give them greater pleasure than easily demonstrate the falsity of a book that attempts to disprove the old standards and set new ones, which inability they must be feeling too embarrassed to admit, committed as thus demonstrating themselves to be to positions that can straightfacedly no longer be supported.

I take it you will agree that Dr. Romer’s association with your College bears directly on its good name. Unavoidably, your own possible acquiescence on this matter will correctly be interpreted as agreement on those actions, in which case, you too will have to bear a corresponding measure of responsibility and of consequences. I therefore take it that you will not acquiesce.

You will not fail to notice that, faced with the dilemma presented to him in my letter of Jan. 10, Dr. Romer chose to send me back the book, thus depriving the library of your College of a most valuable addition that would have cost nothing, and even at worst would have presented an object case of “bad” science and a “bad” science book, on how not to do it and how not to write such a book. Dr. Romer should gladly have taken the opportunity to expound in class, thus further educating your students, *if* he truly could make such a case.

Because Dr. Romer saw to it that the book not remain in the College, thus making it impossible for you at this stage to form an even rudimentary opinion on the subject matter before you, I must give you here a rough idea of what the book is about. Please, note that the following are only some of the topics made a case for in my book.

(a) The true significance of Newton's Law of Gravitation, how it truly applies and its far-reaching consequences have all been missed for three hundred years.

(b) The Michelson-Morley experiment was first conducted about one hundred years ago, but its faulty premises and its faulty analysis have not been realized.

(c) The theory of relativity built its justification upon the results of that faulty analysis. Correctly analyzed, that experiment no longer supports the theory. The Einstein definition of simultaneity upon which the whole relativity edifice rests is demonstrated to be logically flawed by a simple extension of his own thought experiment. The central idea of the seminal relativistic paper by Minkowski which purportedly establishes the “unity” of spacetime is shown to rest on the equality of the velocity of light to both 1 and i which Minkowski proposes in the

same paragraph!!! What the theory “explains” in a contrived manner can be gotten directly from Newton's Law.

(d) The Bohr model of the electron has been recognized as inadequate. However, the faulty premises of that model have been carried over into the current probabilistic theory, which is the reason why so many questions regarding the theory still remain unanswered. The new, physically impeccable, classically sound model of the electron presented in my book automatically answers those questions and resolves and totally dispenses with the problem of indeterminacy.

You will agree that the above are hardly frivolous matters! If my non-“expert” claims are wrong, they certainly cannot be demonstrated to be so by silence! So, the latter must only be the last weapon the “experts” have left to fend off the assault of a non “expert” against the accepted positions. But this is not all! Because, the analysis in my book started with a concept that the “experts” have been at extreme pains to avoid, the concept of a Most Elegant Design, a concept of clearly metaphysical connotation, the validity of which my thesis demonstrates and to the consequences of which I was by logic bound to return and discuss in some detail. I submit, it is this unavoidable connotation that the silence attempts to wish away!

I consider it demeaning of you, and therefore I shall not entertain the thought, that you can possibly become a willing party to this latest attempt of obscurantism. Contrarily, I believe that you will do truly all you can to help bring this matter into the open. I therefore shall be looking forward to hearing from you of your efforts in the very near future.

Very sincerely,

Re: LETTER TO DR. KOCH

Dr. H. William Koch, Exec. Director
American Institute of Physics
335 East 45th Street
New York, NY 10017

February 2, 1987.

Dear Dr. Koch:

This is to inform you about and most strongly protest against the actions of Dr. Romer, Book Review Editor for the Am. J. of Physics and Mr. P. Anderson (or is it R. P. Andersen?) Book Review Editor for *Physics Today* and his superior Dr. T. von Foerster.

According to my records, copies of my book, PRINCIPIA PHYSICA UNIVERSI were delivered to each of them (at Amherst, MA and Woodbury, NY, respectively) by insured mail on Dec. 15, 1986. Dr. Romer replied by letter dated on Dec.30, 1986 and stamped on Jan.5, 1987, to which I responded on Jan.10, 1987. My book was returned to me by UPS on Jan.27, 1987, without a single word of explanation. Copies of my original cover letter of Dec.11, 1986 and of the letters mentioned above are appended hereto.

An identical cover letter was enclosed with my book to *Physics Today*. On Jan.7, 1987, I sent *Physics Today* another letter, a copy of which is also appended hereto. Having received no word from them, in the morning of Jan.29, 1987, I telephoned AIP and spoke to Mr. Anderson, who informed me that his and Dr. von Foerster's decision was that they will neither publish a review of my book nor list it in the "Books Received" columns. I suppose, I will not be off the mark saying that Dr. Romer also must have decided not to list the book.

Whereas it is certainly the right of editors to decide whether or not to review a book, I submit that it is not their right not to list a received book in the "Books Received" list. The fact of delivery of a book automatically establishes an obligation to list the book. Not to list a received book is no less than a *deliberate lie and deception*, because the sentence "Books Received" most certainly can only have the meaning "ALL books received". If it did not have exclusively this meaning, but could also possibly mean "SOME books received—and we reserve the right to list here whichever books we please from all those received", the reader would be at a complete loss to know exactly what was meant. More-

over and equally to the point, the reader depends on the “Books Received” columns to be accurately informed of new books in the field. Thus, deliberately to decide not to list a received book not only is a *lie and a deception unbecoming of gentlemen*, it is also a disservice to the author or publisher who graciously sends a copy of the work, as well as an *unadmitted, dishonorable and reprehensible* attempt to tell the reader wherefrom he may only choose his reading material. In our “sophisticated times”, the old practice of blacklisting of books thus has become at least a tacit conspiracy not to list an “undesirable” book or even admit its publication and delivery and thus to prevent the reader from even being informed that books exist that he may wish to read; from which, persons of dubious logic or expertise have usurped for themselves the absolute prerogative to “protect” him and even not to tell him that they do so!!!

After I was dutifully and logically inescapably flabbergasted at Mr. Anderson’s statement, I asked him to explain to me the reasons of the “neither-nor” decision. He resolutely declined to do so, only stating that it is the privilege of Physics Today so to act, both as to the above, as well as on their not being obliged to give reasons for their acts. I then requested of him that he graciously send me word in writing to the effect of simply stating their decision and their refusal to give reasons. He again refused to do so, and only stated that I should consider myself satisfied with his over-the-phone statements!!! (Wherefrom may I ask has Mr. Anderson gotten the notion that he may make such suggestions-demands to/of authors who have spent untold effort to write prototypical works???) When I told him that it was important for me to have his statements in writing and that “you gentlemen surely must see it as a duty to your conscience and science at least to bring yourselves up to the level of sending even such some statement”, he again refused to promise that he would do so, or to see that he had such an obligation!!! I replied that I found his positions totally unacceptable and unbecoming. In the evening of Jan.29, 1987, he called me back to say that he had checked with Dr. von Foerster and that the latter totally agreed with the positions Mr. Anderson had taken in the morning. He again refused to answer my repeated requests, and even to tell me whether the book, if it were to remain at AIP, would be catalogued and put on a shelf in an accessible library somewhere, or whether it would be destroyed, claiming ignorance of these details!!! Thus, Mr. Anderson ignored deliberately even the substance of the last paragraph of my letter of Dec.11, 1986. On my asking him of his exact name and title, he became extremely defensive, on my asking him of *your* name and address, he refused to give them to me, directing me to call instead the headquarters of AIP!!!

It was in the face of all these refusals and deliberate silence by both Mr. Anderson and Dr. Romer that I was forced to include here for the record all these details.

I take it, Sir, that AIP and its member societies are there in the name of sci-

ence and the common good, and your employees and officials are sufficiently sensitive to these ultimate obligations. It appears that I am wide off the mark in so believing! But, I submit, the time is long gone since faceless persons from on high, threatening burning at the stake, could tell us what to do, even what to think. Doing science in a laboratory does indeed require the approval of “superiors”, but doing science in one’s head is beyond the ability of such “superiors” to control. I was forced to self publish only because faceless reviewers said no without giving sufficient reason and the publishers acquiesced, or because the latter foresaw too little by half of the minimum commercially justifiable market for the book. I thought the book important enough to be published, even if it meant sacrifice, because it raises issues of fundamental importance that only a pitiful duffer or intellectual coward will not face. Now that the bird is out of the cage as it were, the contents of the book, in substance and not in some petty detail, must either be disproven, or admitted in public. You will deceive yourselves if you think that silence is a third possible option open to you. I am duty-bound to see to it that it is not.

Further, I am duty-bound to inform you that unless within two weeks I receive a satisfactory statement from you personally, I shall be forced to regard anything less as a mere variation on the theme of silence. In that case, I shall consider myself free to expose this matter to the public view and to seek restitution for damages to the full extent of the Law. Because today science is conducted at huge public expense, on which directly or indirectly AIP and its member societies subsist, you will agree that doing bad science is at the expense of the public and therefore it is *not* open to one or two or some individuals to restrict the flow of ideas that could provide (the *correct*) answers to basic questions at a lower cost. It follows that restitution shall not be sought only in the name of the author, but also on behalf of those who pay for the huge costs.

Sincerely,

24

Re: THE REPLY OF DR. KOCH

Dr. George P. Stavropoulos
3 Renda Place
Green Brook, NJ 08812

February 13, 1987

Dear Dr. Stavropoulos:

In response to your detailed letter dated 2 February 1987, the American Institute of Physics takes its public responsibility very seriously. In doing so, AIP must rely on the best judgement of its staff members in areas where they are expert. I am sorry that your book did not, in their judgment, warrant inclusion in the Books Section of *Physics Today*.

Sincerely yours,

(Signature)

H. William Koch

HWK: mt

25

Re: SECOND LETTER TO DR. KOCH

Dr. H. William Koch, Exec. Dir.
AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PHYSICS
335 East 45 Street
New York, NY 10017

February 20, 1987.

Dear Dr. Koch:

I am in receipt of your letter of February 13, 1987. Since you force me, I shall be blunt but not unfriendly: I find your letter worthless because in it you only assert but do not prove. Unless the AIP and its member societies have broken with tradition, when a mere paper is submitted to you for publication, you still either publish it or provide to the author the well-reasoned (?) arguments of referees recommending rejection. I submit that, when a whole book of totally original material is submitted for review, that gentlemanly obligation of people committed to the service of science and the pursuit of Truth though modified is correspondingly much heavier. Furthermore, when such a book challenges the accepted theories, you are under the additional heavy obligation either to *prove* and not vacuously assert ("I am sorry that your book did not ... warrant ...") that the challenge is without foundation, or to *write* an objective review on the book AS WELL AS GIVE IT COVERAGE AS A PIECE OF MAJOR NEWS. In failing to do either, the Amer. J. of Physics, Physics Today and you personally as the Director of AIP (cover Institute of all ten member Societies) have miserably failed to discharge your public responsibilities. Your assertion that "the AIP takes its public responsibilities very seriously" flies in the face of these facts.

In the bottom of p.2 of my letter of Feb. 2, I stated that "(my book) raises issues of fundamental importance that only a pitiful duffer or intellectual coward will not face". In keeping silent despite the time-honored practice and tradition, in failing even when explicitly challenged *to prove by reasoned argument* that my book does not warrant discussion or even mention, in insisting on keeping silent, your people and you surely must realize that you make yourselves subject to this characterization.

I am told that my book is "very very well written". Your staffers, then, either must have a language problem, or be incapable of rational thought and only preprogrammed, as mere crude humanoid robots, to reject anything that does not

tally with “instructions”. Because you probably responded with your Feb. 13 letter without having read the book yourself, the grounds for your reliance on them must be re-examined, for I cannot see how your experts failed to realize and inform you on the significance of the book. I shall give you here only a few details of what your experts either willfully tried to suppress, as is more likely, or through sheer incomprehension failed to notice and advise you on:

(a) In the book, I argue that, Reality, whatever it is, is one and indivisible, and as such must it be treated. I do not mean by this any sort of pantheism, but quite simply the unassailable existence of objective partial truths that together and without any conflict constitute the Truth that exists. It is childishly unphilosophical to take an a priori stand against this basic statement. The nature of partial truths and Truth can only be established after the most thorough examination of all objective facts. Physics and metaphysics, or science and religion, as the terms are used, are artificial partitions that must no longer be allowed to hinder progress towards the Truth. Obscurantism of any kind must be eliminated. Artificial, man-made divisions of Reality and Truth must also be eliminated. There can be no conflict between Reality and Logic. Human logic is ludicrously too inadequate to argue against this statement. When conflicts between Reality and Logic appear in our mind, they are due solely to our incomprehension.

(b) Man’s failure to get to the Laws of Nature (*not* his laws of physics that usurp the role of the former) is only due to his proclivity to introduce arbitrary theories based on premises unwarranted by, and in basic conflict with, the objective Reality. No amount of adjustment of such theories can repair the basic falsehood of such premises. It has been a time-honored tradition in science to seek that simplest formulation of Natural Laws that will best and most economically describe the objective facts. By far and away, the noblest objective of science is to determine whether or not Intelligence had had a role in making the World as is. If so, one can expect a Most Elegant Design to be the operating principle. If such Design exists, Reality itself, by reverse analysis, will guide us to it. It is easier to find such a Design in Nature by assuming its existence, for then we know what to look for, than to assume the opposite, for then nothing will drive us to search.

(c) Gravitation as a natural force is an objective fact that in no case can, under such a Design, come to conflict with other aspects of Reality. Planetary motion can be called “geometry”, but this is a mere name-giving. My or your strenuous effort to lift a heavy object when *no* motion is involved is beyond relativity: The *force of muscle* we know we volitionally apply to the task is *not* a matter of the geometry of space. To say that, our volition can affect the geometry of space directly, and when that happens that, space reacts to give us the *impression* of the muscle force that we think we apply but “in reality” we do not, is an altogether incredible statement to make *without adequate proof of fact*, to sup-

plant our *direct* experience of force of muscle. This compels us to consider the elements entering Newton's Law of Gravitation that defines the force of gravity. In that Law, the path along which the separation is being measured is taken to be a Euclidean straight line. But this is a *mere assumption and premise of ours*. Such a path may or may not be the *natural* path of separation that must be used in Newton's Law. Only by meticulous measurement can the issue be decided. A curvilinear separation, as argued in my Note on the Law of Separations (see attachment to my letter of Jan. 7), appears to be the simplest way of naturally establishing the path of separation among *all* bodies in the Universe. Weyl has stated that "Einstein's theory of gravitation does not satisfy Mach's postulate, though historically the latter played a role in its conception. A theory that meets Mach's challenge remains a desideratum" ("Philosophy of Mathematics and Natural Science" Atheneum, New York, 1963, p. 289). My conception permits the most natural introduction of the Mach Principle *without* destroying Newton's Law. The simplicity of that Law thus returns and with it the singularity of G (its replacement by ten lesser quantities in relativity is NOT a simplification, especially when that theory can't even satisfy Mach's principle). The universality of G as used in Newton's Law requires that we consider (under the Most Elegant Design Principle) the universality of G as a property of the entire Universe as implied by the dimensional analysis of Newton's Law. If, already at this stage, the theory of relativity must be abandoned, and "metaphysical" considerations (for that matter, the ordinary – first – universality of G in Newton's Law is NO less "metaphysical") are physically introduced, I submit, it is *not* I but Reality that so demands. Who am I, or you, or anyone of us to go against it? My analysis of the situation shows clearly that the full and far-reaching implications of Newton's Law had so far been missed. Included in them are both a positive, through its total internal consistency and agreement with objective facts, and a negative, through disproving all competing possibilities, proof that the Universe is one of constant G and M (mass), which leads directly to proving the expansion of the Universe, to the ponderability of the photon, to the variability of the velocity of light, to the abolition of the first law of thermodynamics, etc. Surely, your experts *must* know that the constancy of the velocity of light and the conservation of energy are *mere* assumptions valid within the limits of the experimental error, but nevertheless subject to modification within those limits. Do they? And that there is an infinite difference between, say, $\pm 10^{-10}\%$ and $\pm 10^{-\infty}\%$?

(d) The Michelson-Morley experiment has so far been analyzed wrongly and on entirely faulty premises.

(e) The theory of relativity built its justification upon the results of that faulty analysis, though Einstein did not so claim initially. Correctly analyzed, that experiment no longer supports the theory. The Einstein definition of simultaneity, upon which the whole relativity edifice rests, is demonstrated to be logically

flawed by a simple extension of his own thought experiment. The relativistic notion that the velocity of light is commonly constant for all observers regardless of their motion runs in the face of Einstein's own premises upon which he based his own definition of simultaneity! Logic demands that no contradictory premises be considered together in building a syllogism, and that no conclusion disprove the premises upon which it is based. Only external evidence can disprove the whole syllogism. All current rationalizations of the theory willfully ignore a thorough examination of its premises. One need only consider that the central idea of the seminal relativistic paper by Minkowski which purportedly establishes the "unity" of spacetime rests on the equality of the velocity of light to both 1 and i , which Minkowski proposes in cryptic-mystic language in the same paragraph in the face of all logic!!! What the theory "explains" in a contrived manner can be gotten directly from Newton's Law.

(f) The Bohr model of the electron has long been recognized as inadequate. However, the faulty premises of that model have been carried over into the current probabilistic quantum theory, which is the reason why so many questions regarding that theory still persist. [I need only remind you of the characteristic symbol of the atom still used as an emblem by the Atomic Energy Commission!] The new physically impeccable, classically sound model of the electron presented in my book automatically answers those questions and resolves and totally dispenses with the problem of indeterminacy as currently posited.

(g) The true significance of the Planck-Einstein equation $E = mc^2 = hf$ has been missed. Billions of dollars are being spent in search of the fundamental particle, but the search is conducted in a direction exactly opposite to the one suggested by the above relationship. All notions of symmetry are man-made. The most extreme simplicity in Nature is obtained when only one kind of fundamental particle exists and is of minimal non-zero mass. In looking inside the nucleus, we are forced to expend energy to accelerate particles. In so doing, we impart to them real additional mass reporting after collision in the fragments. Their excess mass relative to the initial rest masses is thus fully accounted for. Only after a thorough examination of this principle, and only after it has been proved as inadequate, may we introduce a second kind of fundamental particle, yet, in no case shall the sum mass of the constituent particles exceed the mass of the composite particle, for such a thing would contravene the constancy of M . All else is pseudo-scientific mysticism that attempts to pass as science, all the while at public expense.

(h) The same is true of fundamental forces. A one-kind-of-particle world only needs a one-kind force. We need to know in detail the "nature" of both particle and force and prove them both as inadequate before we can proceed to assume additional forces. In a one-kind-of particle world, that particle perforce is a very small one and fully subject to the law of additivity of mass as hitherto un-

derstood, and the electron can only be understood as a composite of a vast number of such particles. Before we know what is going on *inside* the electron, it is logically and philosophically foolish to argue that electromagnetism is a second force in Nature fundamentally distinct from gravitation, even as it *appears* to look different from the latter! Similarly with the other forces.

The above are only some of the theses you and your experts are obligated to disprove in detail.

Your failure to do so, regardless of excuse, can and shall only be interpreted as your willfully unwilling contribution to the refutation and repudiation of currently established *false* dogmas, that you are forced to witness in, and acknowledge by your, silence. However injurious my findings are to the prestige of theories and people dead or alive, your duty is to act solely as a clearing house of cogent ideas, seeing to it that they get through. You may *not* act as advocates and defenders of current dogma, even to the point of becoming censors accountable to no one when all else fails. Your silence in the face of this challenge shall be your acknowledgement of it as a fact that, a mere metallurgist and non-"expert" is capable of providing a simple, well-written and comprehensible refutation of current dogmas and you "experts" have oversold a package of shoddy goods the quality of which you are no longer capable of guaranteeing, WHICH, HOWEVER, YOU ARE INTENT ON CONTINUING TO FOIST ON THE UNSUSPECTING PUBLIC THAT FOOTS THE TERRIBLY EXPENSIVE BILL.

Because in a well-run organization supporting materials are submitted before a decision is made, I take it, this has already happened in the present case. It will therefore be a simple matter for you to collect the well-reasoned rebuttals of your experts and send them to me (indeed, why you did not do so with your letter of Feb. 13 is beyond me, unless, of course, your assertions in that letter are totally empty). This applies to both the Amer. J. of Physics and Physics Today. I shall no longer deal with the gentleman at Amherst.

Because you have failed to act properly as you should and ought on your own, you force me to put all this on the record here so that you not have an excuse of not understanding what your duties are as gentlemen of science.

You have a week to send me the collected rebuttals by certified mail to assure yourselves of their delivery, and guard against the "demon of the Post Office".

Your failure to respond as just outlined shall (i) be interpreted as your acknowledgement of your having acted on this matter in a most improper manner amounting to (a) discrimination against me and violation of my right to be heard by my co-workers, (b) dereliction in performing your duties, malpractice, negligence and violation of the public trust, in that while you refuse to provide disproof of my findings, that can only be interpreted as inability to produce such

disproof, you at the same time deliberately attempt to censor and suppress my work from becoming widely known, and (c) conspiracy to defraud me and my work of due recognition, all of which are activities that, to say the least, are skirting the limits of civil and criminal law, and (ii) free my hand.

I suppose you agree it is best for science that public airing of linen of dubious cleanliness and the ensuing acrimony be avoided. It is for this reason that I engage in writing this letter. If I, the wronged party, am gracious enough, and mindful of the good name of science enough so as to extend you this additional period, despite the fact that you are testing the limits of my patience, I take it, you too will have the good grace to comply.

Sincerely,

P.S. I will appreciate it greatly if, along with your reply, you send me a list of major figures in science that are dissatisfied with the current status of both relativity and probabilistic quantum theory and working toward a different solution, for I understand that many people are so working, though you may not want to attach to them the adjective “major”. So, I take it, you keep such a list even a short one, for the benefit of easy communication. Failing that, will you please put in the next issue of Physics Today the following letter?:

“People working on Newtonian ideas as opposed to relativistic ones, as well as people dissatisfied with the foundations of the current probabilistic quantum theory are requested to contact me
at 3 Renda Place, Green Brook, NJ 08812;
Tel. (201) 968-2553.

(Dr.) George P. Stavropoulos.”

AUTHOR’S COMMENT: Dr. Koch never responded!

26

Re: REQUESTING COMPETENT DISPROOF

Professor Treiman, S., Chairman
Physics Department
Jadwin Hall
Princeton University. NJ 08544

February 20, 1987.

Dear Professor Treiman

Back in the beginning of July 1986, Prof. Wigner had a quick look at the manuscript of the book, indicated that it looked interesting and suggested that I might want to consider leaving a copy at the departmental library for someone perhaps finding the time to study it. Having tired for almost a year by then of trying to obtain a meaningful response from anyone, I regretfully decided not to take Prof. Wigner's advice, as it would have meant further indeterminate delay. I proceeded to go abroad to save costs and publish the book at my own expense.

On returning to this country, I submitted copies for review to leading journals. The only response that I got was silence! On my calling them, they told me they had decided not to review the work, nor even list it among the Books Received! They were adamant in their refusal to give me any reason in writing or even over the phone for this behavior. This I found highly irregular.

I was forced to complain in writing and challenge them either to disprove my findings or admit them as a significant advance, charging them with a deliberate attempt to suppress the book, amounting to a dastardly act of obscurantism if they failed to do either. So far, I have received no meaningful response, but either assertions or total silence.

I am sending this complimentary copy for evaluation of this whole matter at your Department, but I must insist, in face of these facts, that I have a competent disproof of the main points or some other appropriate comment(s) by April 15, 1987. If by the end of this period, I receive no reply, I will have to conclude that no competent disproof can be produced.

The attachments will give you an immediate idea of some of the scientific and philosophical points dealt with in the book.

Most sincerely,

COMMENT: An identical letter was sent on the same day to Dr. Harry Woolf, Director of the Institute for Advanced Study, Olden Lane, Princeton, NJ 08540, for evaluation at the Institute. On March 16, 1987, he wrote to say he was forwarding both the letter and the book to the School of Natural Sciences. Other than that, I never received a reply from either of these Gentlemen!

Re: SECOND LETTER TO PROF. NEWTON

Dr. Roger Newton
Swain Hall
Dept. of Physics
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47401

February 20, 1987.

Dear Professor Newton,

Events beyond my control force me to request recipients of my book PRINCIPIA PHYSICA UNIVERSI that they be good enough to send me a written well-reasoned disproof at least of the main theses there advanced, or failing that, some other comment(s) they may choose to make. Those same events force me to consider a possible silence of recipients as a tacit admission of inability to produce such disproof.

I fully appreciate the predicament I hereby put you in. I honestly regret having to impose upon you, but can only say that I wish it weren't necessary.

I believe that two full months is a reasonable period of time for recipients to consider the merits and demerits of the book. Allowing also time for writing their response and the mail, in your case, a time limit of March 31, 1987 seems quite reasonable. If you feel otherwise, please, advise.

Most sincerely,

Re: THE REPLY OF PROF. NEWTON

George P. Stavropoulos, Ph.D.
3 Renda Place
Green Brook, NJ 08812

March 19, 1987

Dear Dr. Stavropoulos:

Thank you very much for sending me your interesting book, *PRINCIPIA PHYSICA UNIVERSI*. It is obviously a work of passion and intellect whose full appreciation would require a great deal of study. While I have read some of it, I do not have the free time to peruse it in as much depth and with as much care as would be necessary to be either convinced by your theories or to muster clear-cut arguments against them. I will, nevertheless, pick out a few points.

The center of your theory appears to be equation (2a) on p. 43 [42 in the electronic version of the book], which you arrive at by dimensional arguments. This is, of course, a fascinating relation between physical quantities. If its apparent approximate agreement with reality is more than a coincidence I would say it should be explained by a large theory. It, together with the constancy of G , hardly constitutes a theory in itself. (As you know, Dirac has speculated about a variable G .)

A large part of your book is devoted to arguments against currently accepted theories. I will take up very briefly only a couple of them. Statements such as the footnote on p. 65 [63] are based on no clear evidence and really beg the questions raised by the theory of relativity; that on p. 100, lines 11 to 5 from the bottom [95, lines 11-17 from the top] originates in a misunderstanding of relativity theory. In your detailed analysis of the Michelson-Morley experiment you arrive at a contradiction with relativity (bottom of p. 73) [top of page 71] only by a quite arbitrary and unjustified assumption, namely that your "constant" k is independent of v . If $k = (1 - \rho^2)^{-1/2}$, there is no conflict with the relativistic contraction.

As for the quantum theory of atomic spectra, your model, though different in detail, is in the spirit of the Bohr model, which you attack. But the Bohr model is now almost seventy five years old and obsolete. Quantum mechanics, together with quantum electrodynamics, predicts the details of spectral lines to enormous accuracy. You may feel dissatisfied with certain aspects of the quan-

tum theory, but getting rough agreement with the spectra of one- and two-electron atoms by a new ad-hoc model is no longer a viable alternative to its experimental success.

I am afraid I do not find your theory of the universe convincing, but I wish you success in your efforts to understand nature both in the large and small.

Sincerely

Roger G. Newton

Re: THE REPLY TO PROF. NEWTON

Dr. R. G. Newton
 Dept. of Physics
 Swain Hall-West 117
 Bloomington, IN 47405

March 25, 1987.

Dear Dr. Newton:

I am grateful for your being even so kind as to reply. At the risk of straining your patience, I feel obligated to respond.

Obviously, we look at the problem of the Universe from different perspectives. You prefer to see it explained by some “large theory”. But so far, all theories *have been non-committal*: the more so, the larger they are! And the larger they are, the more their premises upon which they are built become *untested and untestable* from within the theories themselves! To an objective mind, the *proper overall theory evaluation* should include not only numerical agreement of prediction and observation, which may be *secretly* introduced (as when general relativity was *deliberately* adjusted in 1916 to reproduce the *mere form* of Newtonian potential and thus become a “theory” of gravitation, despite its inability to produce ab initio even the value of κ (that only by comparison with the Newtonian potential was accepted as $8\pi K/c^2$) [Einstein did not even like to write G and replaced it by K !; see Eq. (69) p. 160 in the book “*The Principle of Relativity*” Dover Publications, Inc., Standard Book Number 486-60081-5, Library of Congress Catalog Card Number A52-9845], but also some *realistic assessment* of its probability of being true, based on the probability of *each and every original premise* being true as well as of all “if we further assume” propositions used. E.g., each of Einstein’s relativity theories is based on five original premises: the existence of material rigid rods, material standard clocks and inertial frames, the principle of the constancy of the velocity of light as seen from such frames and the special or general relativity principle or “dogma”. In the latter case, as Einstein’s 1916 paper shows, some of the earlier premises are only modified, not dispensed with. But what is the probability of *each* premise being true in the real world? In an expanding Universe having started from zero volume, rigid rods can exist *only later and by special dispensations*! What is the probability of such dispensations really having been granted and *what* happened in the

world before that??? Similarly with clocks and inertial frames!!! In an expanding Universe, the *presumed constant and limiting* value of c *must* be compared with the all-time maximum velocity of expansion, namely, that at $T = 0$. Relativity does not dream of doing that! The relativity principles of Einstein are, really, what we may call neo-preCopernican notions: Why should the *true* physics of the Universe be our *current* physics taught in our schools???

So, as a realist-engineer, I am convinced that no theory will ever be sufficiently conclusive, and I have *never* thought of my findings as constituting a “theory”, but only as an *incontestable* analysis of the *observed very hard facts*: The dimensional analysis of Newton’s law of gravitation is nothing more than just that! So, in the cosmological part of the book, I do *not* advance a theory. I only simply try mercilessly to analyze the crude facts and lay them bare on the table along with the analysis and the conclusions. My ultimate objective is to answer scientifically the question whether the Universe implies Intelligence. Intelligence, acting as an engineer, did *not* need a theory of the world before *It* built it! Only a *clear cut objective* in Mind, a *plan* as to how to make the world in its *fullest* detail, and the power to implement in *Reality*, i.e., make *tangible*, the plan, so that the world perform *pursuant to its, logically, preassigned ultimate objective*! In this Logical sense, Intelligence *implies* Design. Perfect the Intelligence? Most elegant the Design. If so, logically, inescapably, the Design *is* built-in in the world! Reverse logical analysis will lead me, the engineer (us), to it. Inexorably, economy and minimality of laws, the universality of their application and the absence of *all* conflict among the *correct* laws are characteristics of the most elegant Design. If so, Newton’s law of gravitation did *not* just happen, nor G , appearing in it; they *are* parts of, implied by, the Design. So, at the core of my conception of the Universe is the *double* universality of G related to *each* gravitational interaction by Eq.1 (p.30/29) *and* to the Universe as a whole by Eq. 2 (p.42/42). If my conception is correct, both Eqs. 1 and 2 are crude (I mean, *irremovable hard*) facts of the Universe and demand unflinching analysis. Coming straight out of the dimensional analysis of Newton’s law, *they are natural hard facts, not* figments of my (any one man’s) imagination upon which one may build a theory just as any other one. So, the findings of the unflinching analysis *are binding, not optional*!

What we so far (i.e., the now current science) have done is simply to write down the formally similar but non-committal $G = a/d \cdot t^2$ (p.39/39) without realizing that the universality of G demands the universality of d (namely, D) and t (namely, T). In my analysis, the constancy of G is *not* introduced as an independent, preferred or additional premise, but *only* as a Logical possibility satisfying Eq.2 (under the *sole Logical* constraints of Tables 1, 2 and 3). The moderate numerical success of Eq.2a, which you mention, was only the *first* intimation of something important hiding in the crude facts! This only provided the impetus

for the subsequent analysis. The ultimate justification of Eq.2 in the form of Eq.10 (p.53, 58/52, 56) under Eq.21 (p.60/59) is provided by the fact that (a), all other (seven) possibilities of Table 3 (including Dirac's Large Number Hypothesis) are disproven by the crude facts, while (b), the remaining possibility of constant G and M , examined fully in Sect.2.3.2 (p.57 to 146/56 to 136), *withstands the crude facts while itself remaining internally consistent, though demanding a drastic revision of our view of things.*

Important among the findings are Eq.22 and the value 22' (p.61/59) that reinforces the first intimation. How far less controversially (compared to the *cumulative effect of the unevaluated* probability of assumptions underlying the current theories) Eq.22, referring to *this real* Universe, is obtained in my book than the formally similar but essentially non committal $G = 1/6\pi d \cdot t^2$ of the Einstein-deSitter model (that applies to a universe of vanishingly small total mass expanding with an ever increasing velocity – see footnote on p. 60/59) is now plain. Nothing prevents my analysis from being applied to the Einstein-deSitter universe! But when that is done, setting $d = D = M/V$ and $t = T$, the conclusions *cannot* be identical! Under constant G and M , V varies and Eqs. 17 and 18' (p.61/59) follow, but the velocity of expansion *decreases*, which is the exact opposite of the conclusion for the Einstein-deSitter universe! At $T = 0$, dR/dT could not but *be* infinite! The principle of the *present* velocity of light as an absolute limit *is dead!!!* In order to retain the present value of c as a universal constant for all (subsequent to a certain) time, we must find what really it was that caused its velocity in the past to exceed its present velocity, and exactly what happened when that caused the velocity of light to become henceforth independent of the age of the Universe and to be fixed at its present value! But nothing is, or can be, found as the cause of that *Universal* change!!! So, application of my Logical analysis to the Einstein-deSitter model demonstrates that yet another of the premises of special relativity, *and* at least *that* solution of the general relativity *are* grossly false!!! In this spirit, the footnote on p.65/63 is fully justified. But the argument of a variable c was not yet made complete and so, the footnote only meant that m and $mv^2/2$ as seen from any frame are *not* the same: When, relative to a frame, $v = 0$, at least the kinetic energy of a body vanishes, but its mass m does *not* also vanish!: When relative to the Earth you stand on it motionless, you do *not* feel that you become extinct; *nor* does the weight balance on which you stand report your weight as being zero! Let's at last get serious with relativity! Enough is quite enough!

Which brings to your comment referring to a statement on p.100. The relativistic dependence of mass on velocity relates to the system in which the velocity is measured. Is it fictitious or real? Experiment shows *real* effects of the increased mass. Seen from an electron, a proton moving with $v = 0.9c$ is judged as having mass $m_p = 2.3_{m,0}$ and the sum mass of the proton-electron system as

being $m_{e,0} + 2.3m_{p,0}$. Seen from the proton, however, the sum mass is judged as $m_{p,0} + 2.3m_{e,0}$. What, then, is the *real* total mass? And *what* is the *total* $M(\text{ass})$??? These are *straight* questions! Relativity, hiding, *refuses* to answer!!!

I am glad you raise the issue of the MM experiment, but I fear, you judge me wrongly. I am (we are) forced to set k constant, because we get the null result in full face of Eq.23! You set $k = (1 - \rho^2)^{-1/2}$ after α , β , and γ have been set equal to 0, $\pi/2$ and $\pi/2$, respectively! But this does *not* save relativity! For it to be saved, values are needed of k such as to produce $L_0(1 - \rho^2)^{1/2}$ along the principal axis and L_0 along the transverse axis, regardless of their orientation relative to v in Fig.1A (p.71/69). But setting $L_1 \equiv L_0(1 - \rho^2)^{1/2}$ and $L_2 \equiv L_3 \equiv L_0$ produces, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} k_1 &= (1 - \rho^2)^{-1/2}(1 - \rho^2 \sin^2 \alpha)^{1/2}, \\ k_2 &= (1 - \rho^2)^{-1}(1 - \rho^2 \sin^2 \beta)^{1/2}, \text{ and} \\ k_3 &= (1 - \rho^2)^{-1}(1 - \rho^2 \sin^2 \gamma)^{1/2}! \end{aligned}$$

Eqs. 23, then, reduce to

$$\begin{aligned} (1/2)ct &= L_0[(1 - \rho^2)^{1/2}(1 - \rho^2 \sin^2 \alpha)^{-1/2}]^{-1} = L_0[(1 - \rho^2)(1 - \rho^2 \sin^2 \beta)^{-1/2}]^{-1} \\ &= L_0[(1 - \rho^2)(1 - \rho^2 \sin^2 \gamma)^{-1/2}]^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

which, if true, would of course produce anything but a null result!!! The conclusion is inescapable and compelling: The traditional analysis of the MM experiment is grossly false not only as detailed on pp.69 and 70 (66 to 68) but *also* because it ignored the *variable* angles α , β , and γ . The crude facts lie bare on the table. On no other subject did I spent as much time as on this. The finding *cannot* be made to fit special relativity and should *not* be evaded or kept secret!!!

Now as to the theory of atomic spectra. I cannot see what you mean by saying that my [let me here write as] “model” is in the spirit of the Bohr model, unless you only mean that they both try to visualize the happenings inside [what the current quantum theory has called] the “electron cloud” which the current theory [following Heisenberg] forbids. Here, [having, on the *solid* evidence of the dimensional analysis of Newton’s law, found Law (*given inevitably by the Lawgiver*) to control the entire Universe since its coming into being], as an engineer, I just could *not* throw all that to the wind and accept the notion of Heisenberg’s “indeterminacy”! *No engineer can build anything indeterminately!* The *very real* instruments, by means of which the findings are obtained that quantum theoreticians use in their theoretical work, have been constructed *determinately* by engineers! The theoreticians have absolutely no right forgetting all that and talking of “indeterminacy”! We *all*, at day’s end, leave our desks and labs, lock the doors, and in the morning we find them just as we left them the night before!

All this, while total indeterminacy through totally haphazard flow must be taken as ruling within the so-called Planck cubicles of size $(1.616 \times 10^{-33})^3 \text{ cm}^3$ during every so-called Planck “timicle” of 5.391×10^{-44} sec duration? Just ask any professional gambler for the odds of this happening so consistently that *no* human and the entire Universe have *ever* taken notice of it! I *must* say that *all quantum mechanicians are consciously dishonest with themselves building their lives and professional careers on the stability of the entire Universe* while themselves believing in *that supposed by them* fundamental indeterminacy-instability!

Therefore, as an engineer, I *must* side with the [very] young Bohr [seeking some understandable structure], though he made the mistake to build on the Rutherford atom [and ignored the *solid fact* that the hydrogen atom is not just empty space occupied by an electron of size $\sim 10^{-13}$ cm circling faithfully on a diameter at a distance of $\sim 10^{-7}$ cm a proton of size $\sim 10^{-13}$ cm, but very much a *sphere* of size $\sim 10^{-7}$ cm *and* the suggestion of Lorentz that we look for a *spherical* atomic structure! It was thus that he *had* to introduce the *seemingly arbitrary* notion of h in his *saletite-about-a-center-like* conception of the hydrogen atom! How in view of such gross conflict with the reality of the atom Bohr got the Nobel prize for his *original work has still not been explained!*] The older Bohr enmeshed himself far too soon in the *wrong kind of mysticism*, under the influence of which he digressed into almost pure numerology. Such has been his influence that in 75 years we have not produced another, convincing electron model, and so, when we need a *picture*, we revert to his *obsolete* one!

This is lamentable, because logic deserves absolute precedence over [pure] numerical success. My attack on both the Bohr and current theory is based on the identity of notions they use and the logical consequences to which they lead. To them both, the hydrogen atom, pictured as a composite of particles in real time, is a *dipole* laid out along a very thin line, *not* a sphere [as described just above]. Physical sphericity is claimed to be regained by means of the spherical wave-like picture. But this evades the issue of the particle-wave duality, which got out of fashion as an issue of debate only because people tired of it in face of the general inability to resolve it. Evasion or passing out of fashion is not resolution. Logic still demands the latter. The current probabilistic theory, building on the particle picture, can only produce a “volume” of *uncertainty* within which the probability is such and such that the electron is here or there. But in reality, the electron cloud thus produced has volume in “probability space” only because it is a *probabilistic* composite over time of innumerable real-time *dipole* pictures; which whole picture we refuse to accept as resolvable on account of the uncertainty principle that we regard as logically binding! Yet, the principle is only the product of the “picture” of the atom we have made only in our minds, going all the way back to Rutherford.

An engineer *cannot* build the atom based on the uncertainty principle: To build, he needs a *fully detailed* blueprint. If there is structure within the atom, *and there is*, whatever it is, *it has been engineered*, for otherwise the concept of it on the blueprint could not have become reality in the world of crude hard facts. It is only because, as an engineer, I regard this as a logical sine-qua-non that I invested my time and still insist on it. As an engineer, I *cannot* accept evasions, fashions, illusions, mirrors, magic or mere numerology. Even a magician *engineers* his magic!!!

Years ago, my own work on X-ray spectra brought me down to earth when I found that the tabulated data were subject to change and I could never read off the film all *digits* given in the tables, though there was no doubt as to the identity of the spectra. This is a common finding of all experimenters. Before the theory can step in and possess the unevaluated raw data, it is necessary that the experimenter provide a *realistic estimate* of the error involved in the numerical value of *each* spectral line (which must *also* be published but is *not*). When I attempted to obtain error estimates, I found that the claimed great “accuracy” of the numbers given in the tables was fictitious. So, I am compelled to say that logical necessity far exceeds in importance the claimed agreement of numbers, however impressive it looks. However many data points, with a sufficient number of parameters, one can produce their exact “fit” on a curve. But how fitting to reality the curve and the fitted data points really are??? Here, we do not even have a curve but only isolated points, “not given, in general, by an algebraic formula simple or otherwise” as has been written. So, I fail to see how I can be certain of the truthfulness of the impressive-looking agreement.

Further, what I find astounding is that both in the Bohr and current theories the atom increases in size, with *increase* in energy, all the way to infinity, at ionization. In this finite Universe as has always been so far, this is sheer nonsense (you only need to consider the finite extent of the Universe at the claimed age of decoupling and before)! How that and the claims of the current quantum theory about ionization are still countenanced is beyond me. This can be argued on the basis of current knowledge. To this I must add the very great weight of the cosmological *decrease* in energy as the Universe expands that is testified to by the cosmological consequences found based on the dimensional analysis of Newton’s law. Those “certain aspects of the (current) quantum theory” that you mention demand Logical resolution, which the theory *is unable* to provide:

The prompt photoelectric emission clearly suggests that it occurs the very moment the minimal action of value h , has indeed acted! That h represents also the measure of uncertainty has been an article of mystic faith, introduced by Bohr’s school, masquerading for science, resulting from and reinforcing the notions of motion of the quasi-point electron. This, the denial of hidden variables and the denial of simple Rydberg-like expressions explaining all spectra were

out on a limb and subject to overthrow the very moment a new physical model could be produced that would supply such insight and results and resolve in the bargain those “troubling questions”. In fairness, such a model hardly qualifies as ad-hoc. The current theory, Dirac felt, *must eventually be replaced* despite its great success. I do not want to throw it to the wind yet! We can and must still use it as heuristic algorithm until a correct *realistic, not probabilistic*, theory is fully developed. I consider my model as the new first step in the direction Dirac suggested; and it cannot but *must* be admitted that this new model is far superior to the original Bohr model. There can be no doubt that had it been discovered first, the theory *would have developed differently* also!

Suffice it here to repeat that, the new model: (a) meets fully *all* physical requirements of the atom; (b) is in the spirit of the Lorentz’ suggestion; (c) does *not* introduce the h out of the thin air, as it takes advantage of the *solid fact* that the moment of inertia of a spherical shell vibrating radially about a middle radius has the dimensions of action; (d) does *not* a priori claim that h is a universal constant but lets the experimentally determined spectra show that action comes in whole units of h ; and (e) permits us to comprehend how the classical notions of mechanical operations work inside the atom too, *at least* as far as the functioning of the electron is concerned, thus extending our understanding of *designed* universal operations to include even those inside the atoms to which we thus obtain access!

In closing, what I find most disturbing about the two great current theories is that they neither provide a blueprint for construction nor permit retrieval of all that is needed to complete the reverse logical analysis from the engineer’s viewpoint. They both are restrictive and prohibitive. Denying him an absolute reference point prevents the engineer from even beginning *on any kind* of engineering work, though the world *is here and operating in a way proving that it unquestionably has begun as a construction at a definite past time*! Denying the sculptor the right to caress each point of his creation to feel and thus check on the degree of perfection already attained is denying all classical sculpture. Believing that the intricacies of Rococo cathedrals simply happened and *were not placed there by hand*, and denying the viewer the intrinsic right to appreciate the full detail that the artist cared to impart to his creation is cultural *and thus also spiritual* suicide. Can this be what modern so-called “science” is truly all about? “The current theories *are* dangerous to our mental and spiritual health”!!! We *must* understand at least that!!! Logic is one, or is nothing!!!

Sincerely,

P.S. Regarding the Michelson-Morley experiment: Giving more thought to k ,

any value of it, as long as it is common for all axes, produces a null result. But for any non-unity value, especially a variable one, theoretical reasons convincing in themselves *must* be produced, and/or experimental verification. I could and still can not produce such reasons. Without such reasons, simply to propose a particular value solely in order to save an existing theory strikes me as patently ad-hoc. Your suggestion that, may be, $k = (1 - \rho^2)^{-1/2}$ would produce the values

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 &= L_0(1 - \rho^2)^{1/2}(1 - \rho^2 \sin^2 \alpha)^{-1/2}, \\ L_1 &= L_0(1 - \rho^2)^{1/2}(1 - \rho^2 \sin^2 \beta)^{-1/2}, \\ L_3 &= L_0[(1 - \rho^2)^{1/2}(1 - \rho^2 \sin^2 \gamma)^{-1/2}]. \end{aligned}$$

Can special relativity be modified to produce such values, or values with the $(1 - \rho^2)^{1/2}$ term dropped altogether? For it is the duty of a theory to come to terms with the irreducible fact that the parallel and transverse axes still stand in the ratio $(1 - \rho^2 \sin^2 \alpha)^{-1/2} / (1 - \rho^2 \sin^2 \beta)^{-1/2}$. Tradition has ignored this and claimed that the ratio is simply $(1 - \rho^2)^{1/2}$ regardless of orientation. It is this claim that relativity has so far been taken as supporting, and it was on this basis that the argument on p.117 above was made. But even if such modification can be achieved, the issue alone of the *variability* of the velocity of light required by Newton's law under constant G and M vitiates special relativity as a (long-term) universal theory.

Attention on p.73 (corrected in the electronic version) made me see another erratum! On line 17 from the bottom the cosines were written as sines!!! Errors/mistypings do prop up where one least expects them!

AUTHOR'S COMMENT: This is a re-edited and extended yet otherwise faithful version of the original. This was judged necessary as the reader of this volume cannot be expected to have already studied the "*Principia Physica Universi*", nor to appreciate allusions made in the original letter sent to Prof. Newton. For this reason, some extra but not foreign facts of knowledge and scientific speculation had to be included here for a better understanding of the situation here debated.

Professor Newton did *not* respond to this Letter.

30

Re: ON THE RELATIVITY OF CLOCKS

(Sent for publication to Physical Review on April 8, 1987; there it received the Code Number SD 3605D, but was refused review and publication on the excuse that the Review no longer publishes articles on relativity theory!!!)

(Summary)

The basic principles and assumptions of special relativity are restated and critically analyzed. The problems relating to simultaneity, underlying the theory, are discussed in detail and shown to have been inadequately appreciated from the beginning. Also shown is that the conclusion of the relativity of time was based on the extension of the Lorentz transformations to clocks, during which, the (specific) distance travelled by the clock, $x_C = vt$, was falsely equated to the (general) distance travelled by the light front in the x -direction, $ct\cos\alpha$. When corrected, time dilatation reverses to contraction.

PACS number: 03.30+p.

Two orthogonal frames $K(x,y,z,t)$ and $K'(\xi,\eta,\zeta,\tau)$ are so chosen that their respective spatial axes are parallel and exactly coincident at $t = 0$, as marked by a clock C permanently stationary at the origin O of K , whereupon, another clock C' permanently stationary at the origin O' of K' is also set to indicate $\tau = 0$, while the frames, thus always carrying their respective clocks at their origins, are in relative motion, K' moving with constant velocity v along the positive common x - (or, ξ -) direction.

These are the frames of special relativity theory. Simultaneity of events and synchronization of clocks are the basic concepts on which the theory is built. Events are truly simultaneous when their time coordinates are identical *in all respects*. (What this means will be made clear as the discussion progresses). Pre-relativistic physics had assumed the existence of a single, universal, time scale in which events could easily be synchronized. Subsumed in that view was the possibility of an infinite velocity of signal transmission. Einstein was the first to recognize that that possibility does not really exist given the finiteness and limiting nature of the velocity of light. Even assuming that no other delays exist in transmitting signals, the finiteness of the velocity of light is sufficient to create ambiguities about the success of physical “observers” attempting to estab-

lish simultaneity and synchronization. His special relativity theory ¹ was an attempt to address those ambiguities. However, Einstein recognized that there exist insurmountable difficulties which can be cleared out of the way only *by definition* (his emphasis) and a multitude of assumptions presumed free of contradictions ². Here, we shall try to distinguish those features of simultaneity and synchronization used in relativity theory that are absolutely certain and bring to light those features that are not, but are still implicitly subsumed in its assumptions, the significance of which has not yet been fully recognized. We are guided in this by the recognition that a theory that attempts to resolve basic questions of kinematics is more trustworthy the fewer its ambiguities about questions of simultaneity and synchronization.

Clocks are fully synchronized only when (a) they are set to indicate an identical “time” at an identical moment *in time* (set-zero synchronization) and (b) they are checked, after a period *of time* to verify that they still show the same “time” (rate synchronization). *Both* steps are essential and necessary. Because the velocity of signal transmission is finite, only clocks *in the same place (same point in space) at the same time* can be fully and unambiguously synchronized. Clocks at different places may be said or believed to be synchronized, but in absolutely strict terms, this is always loose talk, because it involves definitions, assumptions and ambiguities that *cannot* all be fully resolved. Even clocks fully synchronized as above, when separated (by being set to relative motion), can no longer strictly be said to have remained fully synchronized. The full effects of being set to motion (acceleration), uniform motion (if attained) and possible subsequent change in the state of motion upon the ultimate internal constitution of “clocks”, and thus upon their rate, quite simply are totally unknown. The full extent of our ignorance is hidden behind largely unevaluated definitions, assumptions, or pure silence.

Einstein distinguished between systems K and K' by calling the first “stationary” and the second as “in motion relative to the first”. Relativity theory accepts the full reversibility of these names. However, when the theory was developed, our notions about the Universe were different from what they are now, and they gave (or implied) significance to the terms used by Einstein that is no longer warranted. Fundamental amongst those notions was the idea that there exist physical places in the world (namely, physical bodies), say, A and B, the distance between which remains naturally constant, if they are not disturbed, and is measurable by means of rigid rods of absolutely invariable length, places in which clocks of absolutely invariable rate can be installed, places between which light signals can be exchanged with absolutely constant velocity, places which can be organized into separate systems of reference, capable of uniform motion relative to each other, yet, each absolutely invariable in itself. Even in view of the now generally accepted expansion of the Universe, all these notions

require critical in-depth re-examination, but this still belongs to the future, as the full consequences of the now accepted expansion have yet to be realized. Going far beyond current conception, Stavropoulos³ has shown that Newton's law of gravitation implies a totally different (from that currently conceived) kind of universal expansion of uncompromising strictness, in the face of which, only few of past or current notions can be taken as safe. His findings allow the sharpest juxtaposition yet of relativity as a human theory to the real world organized according to objectively existing natural law. Here, the problem of the relativity of time shall be examined from a more familiar angle.

Einstein² accepted the existence of clocks A and B indicating times as follows: At "A time" t_A , light from A is sent to B arriving there at "B time" t_B and instantly reflected back arriving at A at "A time" t_A' . He *assumed* that the clocks synchronize if

$$t_B - t_A = t_A' - t_B,$$

by defining, that is, by a priori accepting as valid, that, the "time" light takes to arrive from A to B is equal to the "time" it takes to return back to A. At best, this line of thought is most curious, because while Einstein intended all along to deny the existence of absolute time in the pre-relativistic sense, he nevertheless found it altogether impossible not to evoke it! For without such evocation, the above equality loses all physical and logical significance. Differences between events can only be accepted as objectively existing and can only be compared and set equal, if they pertain to a feature *common* to all those events. Einstein evaded this fundamental problem by means of the device of the above quotation marks that *are his*.

This entire Einsteinian scheme is logically extremely disturbing as it constitutes the basis for the synchronization of all clocks stationary relative to a particular system. How disturbing this scheme really is can be made clear by the following: If the only four-legged animals on Earth were cats, and we saw, dimly through imperfect telescopes four-legged animals on Mars (assumed at an unknown distance) that were nevertheless elephants, we might be tempted to set up differences such as (elephants minus cats) and (cats minus elephants). As we know since the first day in school, such differences are logically forbidden, unless four-leggedness, the only real common feature, is the sole issue addressed. Einstein's times t_A and t_A' are cats, and time t_B elephants. The common time that he evaded yet evoked is wholly corresponding to four-leggedness. In logically strict terms, if the notion is to be insisted upon that no common time exists, differences of clock indications at different places and "times" *cannot and may not* be used at all.

So, also in strict terms, the certainty of rate synchronization of clocks C and C' has been rendered impossible to state, as a result of their motion that only

allows them to be found in a common place at a common time but for an instant. *Only* their set-zero synchronization remains unambiguous.

The two frames mark the event of their absolute coincidence by instantaneously emitting, at coincidence, a spherical “wave” of light. The principle of the constancy of the velocity of light as understood by relativity theory, applied to the two frames, states that henceforth

$$x^2 + y^2 + z^2 - c^2t^2 = 0, \quad (1)$$

$$\xi^2 + \eta^2 + \zeta^2 - c^2\tau^2 = 0, \quad (2)$$

namely, that the light front propagates in such a way as legitimately to be regarded as perfectly spherical about each origin when “perceived” from each of the two frames. The grave geometrical problems Eqs. 1 and 2 raise are of course numerous, but are all put aside by the theory, by virtue of the fact that these equations are accepted as a single indivisible postulate. Instead of being subjected to existing geometrical notions, they create new ones. Still, it is an irreducible hard fact that light in homogeneous empty space propagates as a *single* perfect sphere.

The special relativity principle demands that Eqs. 1 and 2 transform identically to each other. Einstein showed that this can happen only if

$$\begin{aligned} \xi &= \beta(x - vt); \eta = y; \zeta = z; \\ \tau &= \beta(t - vx/c^2); \beta = (1 - v^2/c^2)^{-1/2} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Then, Eq.2 transforms as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \beta^2(x - vt)^2 + y^2 + z^2 - \beta^2 c^2(t - vx/c^2)^2 \\ &= \beta^2[(x - vt)^2 - c^2(t - vx/c^2)^2] + y^2 + z^2 \\ &= \beta^2(x^2 + v^2 t^2 - 2vxt - c^2 t^2 - v^2 x^2/c^2 + 2vxt) + y^2 + z^2 \\ &= \beta^2[(1 - v^2/c^2)x^2 - (1 - v^2/c^2)c^2 t^2] + y^2 + z^2 \\ &= \beta^2(1 - v^2/c^2)(x^2 - c^2 t^2) + y^2 + z^2 \\ &= x^2 + y^2 + z^2 - c^2 t^2 \end{aligned}$$

In light of the principles set, the intrinsic and *inescapable* ambiguity of synchronization of clocks that do not, or cannot participate in a common (k,l,m, n) event and the above detailed transformation, it is beyond any doubt that the quantities (x,y,z) and (ξ,η,ζ) are nothing other than the *estimates*, of “observers” “fixed” at the origins O and O', of the spatial coordinates of all points in homogeneous empty space reached by the advancing light front at the *identical* moment in time at which “times” t and τ are *actually* indicated by the clocks C and C' at the origins O and O'. (Required in order to obtain the estimate is knowledge of the value of c). Conversely, the quantities t and τ are nothing other than the *identical estimates*, of the indications of the clocks C and C' at the origins O and O', of all “observers” in homogeneous empty space, in which alone light

propagates as a single perfect sphere (it being assumed that observers are thought to be fixed at all points in space), who at an identical moment in time are *actually* reached by the advancing light front and who at that moment regard themselves as having coordinates (x,y,z) when referred to K and as having coordinates (ξ,η,ζ) when referred to K'.

[Remarks: (1) As already stated, the indications of clocks at all points except at O and O' do not matter and cannot be used as their synchronization (both set-zero and rate) has never been set and if assumed it is not unambiguous. The theory leaves unclear the exact geometrical status of observers relative to fixed positions in space. As it denies absolute reference, it essentially has to leave them floating uncertainly as regards space, but somehow, certainly fixed as regards the lattice positions of the systems K and K'.

(2) Whether there is really only one sphere of observers in space or two ("co-moving") spheres, one to each frame, that simultaneously receive the light front is also rather unclear: The theory seems to prefer two spheres of observers, since a single sphere would appear to imply absolute fixity in space; and to have two centers in relative motion to each other, yet, both equally legitimate. Still, the hard fact of light propagating in space as a *single* sphere requires that at any given instant a *single* sphere of observers be reached, and Einstein⁴ speaking of the transformation of Eqs. 1 and 2 clearly suggests a single sphere (though earlier⁵ he clearly spoke of clocks moving *with* the frames). In the latter case, as the origin O' moves in the positive x-direction, the observers relative to it can only move in the negative x-direction. However, the characteristically relativistic notion of co-moving frames with "observers" fixed in them clearly requires that the observers also move in the positive x direction. (It is likely that not all relativists will voice a single opinion on this important matter).

(3) Required in order to obtain a *good* estimate is knowledge of *c* and the sphere radius. In the case of co-moving spheres, the observers may be regarded as having been supplied the latter information also, coming implicitly with the knowledge of their coordinates. In the case of a single sphere of observers, the instantaneous coordinates of the moving origin O' are also needed and the *fixed* coordinates of the stationary origin O and of the observers in K are clearly implied].

Important and *inescapable* in this logical analysis are the three concepts (a) "at the *identical* moment in time", (b) "*all* 'observers' *fixed* in homogeneous empty space", implied by the hard fact of a single spherical light front in space, and (c) "'observers' 'fixed' at the origins O and O' ". Of these, the first concept actually begs the question of an *absolute* time in which alone an *identical* moment can unambiguously be understood. The second concept begs the question of a universal absolute reference system of spatial coordinates, in which, positions in space (and observers in them) can be understood as *factually* motionless at which light arrives in equal lapsed time(s) after emission. The third concept mere-

ly juxtaposes the far less-well-defined, in the terms of the space of the second concept, positions of the origins O and O' and of the light front as hastily introduced and used in building up the relativity arguments. Thus, inextricable in relativity theory is the fact that, in reality, it deals only with *estimates* of events — events that *can fully be understood only in terms of an absolute* system (X,Y,Z,T) — of observers, who, lacking in knowledge of the *absolute* (X,Y,Z,T) system, are forced to *invent* their systems (x,y,z,t) and (ξ,η,ζ,τ) , in which however they are able to know either *only* the spatial or *only* the temporal coordinates (but *not both*) of events involving light, *except only once*, when, at a particular common event (their spatial and temporal absolute coincidence), their two systems coincide absolutely, and so can absolutely be set-zero synchronized as $(0,0,0,0)$. In short, the events (x,y,z,t) and (ξ,η,ζ,τ) of special relativity are *estimated-composite* and *not* factual, and the clocks C and C' *never* co-experience events such that $(x,y,z) \neq (0,0,0)$ and $(\xi,\eta,\zeta) \neq (0,0,0)$, respectively. As a result, both the accuracy of these estimates and their physical significance, and inevitably all theorizing built upon them, must be considered as doubtful since they cannot unambiguously be assessed.

Further doubt is cast on the whole special relativistic scheme by the realization that the concepts of “rigid rods” and “clocks”, in terms of which Eqs. 1 and 2 are written, are used without *sufficient and prior* clarification of what they *physically* represent when used to “measure” the events represented by Eqs. 1 and 2: Unless “rigid rods” can be laid down end-to-end *instantaneously at time* t or τ to match the exact ground covered by light *in time* t or τ , (or, if preset on the ground, to be *instantaneously surveyed and checked for constancy over their total length* at time t or τ), which is physically impossible at any rate, the exact meaning of Eqs. 1 and 2 is in jeopardy. Similarly with the clocks: The fundamental problem of how they are precalibrated as henceforth to be accepted as reliable is *not really* taken up. Relativity theory *leaves these problems deliberately obscure* in the beginning and only returns later to them when it attempts to claim that Eqs. 3 also apply to the rods and clocks themselves. Is this legitimate for a physical theory? Land transfer deeds are legally binding because (i) there is prior agreement on the rods, and (ii) pegs have been installed in the ground absolutely to delineate the property. If these matters were left for subsequent determination, no land deed would or should ever be signed. Here then is the rub of the problem: Without something quite definite *presaid* of the rods and clocks, Eqs. 1 and 2 *cannot* be written and Eqs. 3 *cannot* be derived. After we have laid down these equations (presumably thus pertaining to reliably made measurements), are we logically permitted to adjust the meaning attached to the instruments used, and even to declare that there is no absolute ground (corresponding to the absolute, for their purposes, ground in which surveyors fix their pegs), despite the fact that such ground is inescapably implied all along as concepts (a)

and (b) above so clearly show? Even if these questions are answered affirmatively, the fundamental problem of dealing only with *estimates* cannot be made to go away. Essentially, what those who oppose relativity claim is that, there is an *absolute* ground to which these estimates correspond, *which intrinsically is free of all relativity*. Without such ground, no measurement, nor estimate of a potential measurement, is possible.

The full import of this detailed description and distinction appears to have remained unappreciated from the beginning. In the part titled “Definition of Simultaneity”², Einstein essentially evaded the core issue of built-in ambiguity by what logically can now only be considered as arbitrary *definition* (his emphasis) and assumptions of doubtful validity further extended later⁵. The present objective is not to analyze further the problem of simultaneity, but rather to draw attention to another important related problem, the significance of which can be understood even without full resolution of the former.

Immediately after stating Eqs. 3⁶, Einstein [firstly, having failed to appreciate the true estimated-composite nature of the statements (x,y,z,t) and (ξ,η,ζ,τ) referring exclusively to events occurring at the light front, which events alone are described by Eqs. 1, 2 and 3; secondly, having thought of Eqs. 3 as binding even for the supposedly physical instruments used in this purely imaginary “thought experiment”, which instruments are fully subject to the geometrical uncertainties already discussed; and thirdly, having failed to realize the huge difference between relationships having to exist between *estimates* of quantities making it possible for Eqs. 1 and 2 to transform to each other and the crude forces that alone may possibly cause hard physical instruments to change depending on their state of motion] suggested their physical meaning by applying them without *any* justification to so-called rigid bodies⁶ and “qualified” clocks⁷. The all-important step of convincingly demonstrating the validity of Eqs. 3 as regards all natural phenomena and bodies, and not only those “phenomena” from which Eqs. 3 were expressly derived and for which alone Eqs. 1 and 2 are valid, was passed up in total silence. Such logical demonstration remains lacking to this day. One may argue that the applicability of Eqs. 3 to material bodies has (had) effectively already been demonstrated experimentally by the Michelson-Morley experiment, and to clocks, by time dilatation measurements. As regards the former, Stavropoulos³ has proven that the accepted analysis of the Michelson-Morley experiment is grossly false and that when correctly analyzed that experiment no longer supports the unqualified extension of Eqs. 3 to material bodies. Here, we intend to focus only on the applicability of Eqs. 3 to clocks.

On the thirteenth page of his paper⁷, Einstein asked “What is the rate of this clock [that ‘marks the time τ' ’] when viewed from the stationary system?”. Never before till then had he posited, discussed or in any way resolved the entirely distinct issue of clock rates and their comparison. His earlier discussion of

simultaneity and clock indications was limited to the single-event, set-zero clock comparisons. (As has already been stated, two-event clock rate comparisons are valid only when both clocks are synchronized at absolute spatial and temporal coincidence and then re checked at a similar absolute coincidence. Failing that, set-zero and rate synchronization can be established only by comparison with a third and *absolute* (master) clock, marking *absolute perfect* time, *not* subject to *any* variation while in transit, that can be transferred from place to place to be locally compared with clocks there situated. The existence of such a clock *is specifically denied* by relativity theory). Still, Einstein proceeded to answer his own question by arguing as follows: “Between the quantities x , t and τ , which refer to the position of the clock, we have, evidently,

$$x = vt \quad \text{and} \quad \tau = (t - vx/c^2)(1 - v^2/c^2)^{-1/2}. \quad (4)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \tau &= t(1 - v^2/c^2)^{1/2} = t - [1 - (1 - v^2/c^2)^{1/2}]t. \dots \\ &\equiv t(1 - v^2/2c^2). \end{aligned}$$

It is quite clear that in this argument, Eq. 4 was taken directly from Eqs. 3 developed earlier⁸, and *in* it Einstein introduced $x = vt$ to obtain

$$\tau = t(1 - v^2/c^2)^{-1/2}(t - v^2t/c^2) = t(1 - v^2/c^2)^{1/2}. \quad (5)$$

Because all subsequent statements about the relativity of time are based on it, it is this argument of Einstein which we here intend to analyze: For as is clear from the exact quotation, in this argument, Einstein (having evaded giving due regard to the issues discussed in the last two paragraphs) arbitrarily and falsely equated the (specific) distance travelled by the moving clock, correctly written *only as* $x_C = vt$, which also is the distance travelled by the origin O' , to the projected (in the x -direction) distance of the (general) light event (x,y,z,t) from the origin O , $x = ct\cos\alpha$! Nowhere in his development was any attempt made to show, and it cannot be shown, that the requirements for clock rate comparison had at all been met: All previous discussion, the positing of Eqs. 1 and 2 and the development of Eqs. 3 never required anything more than set-zero-type statements. In face of these facts, the cautious thinker is obligated to insist that if x in Eqs. 3 is to be replaced by something, it can only be replaced by its quite implicit equivalent

$$x = ct\cos\alpha \quad (6)$$

and nothing else. We should not be misled into believing that Eqs. 3 refer generally to systems of coordinates *actually composed* of grids of rigid rods and clocks in relative motion, and so, that they are applicable to all phenomena. If they did so, they should be derivable also from the hard physical facts pertaining to such systems. In reality, the use of the imaginary grid, supposedly composed of rigid rods and clocks (which are just as imaginary), was purely an artificial-imaginary device employed for the express and exclusive purpose of transforming Eqs. 1 and 2 to each other. As a result, the coordinates (x,y,z,t) and (ξ,η,ζ,τ)

may *not* refer to anything else but solely to the very same phenomena described by Eqs. 1 and 2. [That Einstein was wrong in this is also shown by the fact that use of $x = vt$ in the first of Eqs. 3 produces uniformly and at all times $\xi = 0$, which is true as the coordinate of O' referred to K' but absurd when referred to Eq. 2. Just as this use cannot be allowed, so too Einstein's unjustified argument based on $x = vt$ must be rejected]. It is best that Eq. 6 be explicitly included in Eqs. 3 to avoid confusion. Thus, the first and fourth of Eqs. 3 are, respectively, equivalent to

$$\xi = \beta x(1 - v/c \cdot \cos \alpha) \quad (7)$$

$$\tau = \beta t[1 - (v/c) \cos \alpha]. \quad (8)$$

[That the arguments developed here are correct is tellingly proved by the fact that if generally applicable, Eqs. 3 should lead to recovering the exact set of values of coordinates in the one system that corresponds to an exact set of values of coordinates in the other system (just as from $x' = x - a$, for $x' = 0$, we can recover $x = a$ for the origin of the x' system; and for $x' = -a$, we can recover $x = 0$ for the origin of the x system). But this is not the case: E.g., we *know* that to the set $(\xi, \eta, \zeta, \tau) \equiv (0, 0, 0, 0)$ there corresponds the set $(x, y, z, t) \equiv (0, 0, 0, 0)$. Using the values $\xi = 0$ and $\tau = 0$ in Eqs. 3, however, does not produce $x = 0$ and $t = 0$ as it should, but rather $x = vt = v^2 x/c^2$ and $t = vx/c^2 = v^2 t/c^2$ (though using $x = 0, t = 0$ does produce $\xi = 0, t = 0$)! No such difficulties exist with Eqs. 7 and 8. One must wonder whether mathematics that produce such paradoxes when referred to unambiguously known events can be trusted to give the correct answers when events are considered that are difficult to imagine and even more difficult to express exactly].

Eq. 4 in its fully equivalent non-paradoxical form of Eq. 8 precludes the use Einstein put it to. The *only* time the positions of (light front and) clocks coincide is at the moment of emission from the momentarily common origin, namely, the event $(0, 0, 0, 0)$, when $x = x_{C'} = 0$ also. This meets only half of the requirements for rate synchronization. At that moment, *if and only if* t and τ also *represented the rates*, namely, the durations of the respective units of time, by Eq. 4, for $x = 0$,

$$\tau = t(1 - v^2/c^2)^{-1/2} \cong t(1 + v^2/2c^2), \quad (9)$$

and the moving clock would be *fast*, not slow as concluded by Einstein! But one will be ill-advised to reach this conclusion on the basis of this argument alone, because, Eq. 8, though fully equivalent to Eq. 4 cannot generally be reduced to Eq. 9, as that would require that $\cos \alpha$ be uniformly zero for the entire light front. So, generally, Eqs. 4 and 8 do not represent and cannot be made to represent rates but only the corresponding *estimates* of clock indications *believed* to pertain to the same estimated-composite event noted as (x, y, z, t) or (ξ, η, ζ, τ) . No more can generally be said of the matter.

However, if uniform motion does not affect the rates of clocks, or does so

reversibly, because the angle α is the angle between the velocity vector $\vec{v}$ and the general velocity vector $\vec{c}$, during a uniform motion of C' along a closed path, upon return to the original position, the integrated effect of the term $(v/c)\cos\alpha$ will sum up to zero. Then, upon reunion, the clock indications will relate according to Eq. 9. Because, in this manner, the clocks are returned to absolute coincidence, the times lapsed t and τ will again be directly comparable, and proportional to the rates of the clocks. The entire cycle may in fact legitimately be regarded as a single time unit. In light of these arguments, Eq. 9 represents the only legitimate relationship of clock rates under the stipulations mentioned. Not Einstein's Eq. 5.

But is this a true physical picture? Will clock C' upon returning to C really indicate τ while C indicates t ? Or are these *only the time estimates* of reunited observers for the position of the light front at the moment of reunion? The detailed analysis suggests that t and τ are nothing more than time estimates! The only hard physical fact in this entire mental exercise is the singular light front sent out at $t = \tau = 0$. Why should that far-off event cause the clocks to change their rates? Strictly speaking, in an experiment such as this, if C has not truly remained stationary at the center of the only hard physical fact employed that we call "spherical light front", but is itself moving in space, clock reunion will *not* occur at the true center of the light front. Now, it is *not* wise to deny the existence of such a center, because just as the spherical light front is a singular physical fact, so too is its center, and as there is nothing to suggest that that center moves in space (which can only happen if the light front as a whole moves in a particular direction), it must be equally difficult to deny that that point does not constitute a point of absolute reference, notwithstanding the fact that nobody has truly remained at it in the interim. The center of the light front *can at all times be reconstituted* from the front itself, just as we can find the *exact* center of a sphere from its surface, or recover the center of a circle from its periphery even if we accidentally erased it. So, the hard physical fact of the spherical light front implies unavoidably the equally hard fact of an *absolute* reference point in space, despite the physical difficulty of locating it! (Which proves beyond doubt that our theories and physical predicament as observers in no way oblige Nature to obey man-made theories disrespectful of the hard natural facts!). Is it then wise to insist upon the validity of a theory that is built for the express purpose of denying the existence of such an absolute reference point, while all along, in its hidden way, it never doubted it? To the extent that relativity theory contacts the real world of hard fact through the possibility of emitting a real spherical light front from a point in homogeneous empty space, the conclusion seems inescapable that at best Eqs. 1 and 2 cannot both be valid. The equation of the light front can only be given in its simplest form relative to a reference system centered at all times at the true physical center of the wave front. By means of a

clock at that center, we can calculate the distance to (but can never physically experience) the front, under the additional *assumption* of a constant c . It is very difficult to avoid the inference that a clock, keeping perfect rate, situated at that center, is indeed fully equivalent to an absolute master clock. And so, to the extent that other "qualified" clocks returned *to it* are *found* to indicate differently, they must be concluded to have suffered *real* changes in their ultimate internal constitution as a result of their *motion* through space, that are manifested by the fact that they no longer keep the same time. [In this regard, the cautious thinker will find particularly *odd and suspect* the fact that relativity theory (on the basis of Eq. 5) holds that time dilatation is real (and a traveller will return younger, which is an attractive feature, *psychologically*, that may have helped the theory in being accepted), but spatial deformation is not (as when it is claimed that railroad cars placed exactly to contact each other will be seen by a fast moving traveller to separate contracting about their centers, which totally ignores what happens to their, hidden, couplings, which, if they too contract as they should, proves the lie of the earlier statement, all this being an argument that can but will not here be further elaborated) but only due to the "relativistic perspective" (which, if not true, and contraction does occur, is an unattractive feature, *psychologically*, which may probably explain why spatial deformation of bodies has so far only been taken as apparent!). Such contradictory claims smack of preferential treatment, which, in light of the claimed unification of space and time is entirely unjustified. Since all relativistic phenomena hinge on Eqs. 1, 2 and 3, logically they all must either be real or apparent].

If despite all these arguments, it is still held that relativity really is about phenomena and not merely about *estimates* of phenomena based on *arbitrary* principles and assumptions, arbitrariness will be reduced if we return to Eq. 9, not to Eq. 5 of Einstein. Accordingly, relativity really implies time contraction, not dilatation, for the moving frame. And so, the hard fact must be faced that experiment, if it is to be trusted in these matters, seems to support Einstein's falsely reached false conclusion, Eq. 5, not the correctly reached correct conclusion, Eq. 9. Experimental verification of a *false* statement *in no case* may logically vindicate the statement. If experiment can be trusted, special relativity must stand falsified. Not so much on account of its mathematics, as its principles and assumptions. It is to be noted that the argument, as fully developed, of Eq. 9 representing the relationships of clock rates is free of *all* ambiguity (other than that relating to real changes due to motion), as the clocks meet in a single event upon reunion. So, it is quite clear that, falsification is not due to some hidden ambiguity engaged upon in building the argument, but refers directly to the principles of the theory.

So far, relativity theory has been questioned through the problem itself of the relativity of observation. Einstein insisted on the total equivalence of obser-

vation from systems K and K'. So, the argument *cannot* be made light that *with equal right, each frame can regard itself alternately as stationary or moving*. The other clock, respectively, must then be regarded *and seen* (if the theory be true) as fast or slow, while it cannot really be both or alternately either! The world *cannot* be such as, or be forced to change appearance in order to be seen, to accord with how I, arbitrarily yet freely, choose to regard myself. By Einstein's reckoning, now shown to be false, the alternation in how each frame chooses to regard itself should result in seeing alternately and respectively the other clock as slow or fast, which also is impossible! Resolution of these issues has been sought in the mathematics of the theory and external reference to distant stars. Such reference is contrived. No theory should, or logically can, be rescued from its own contradictory consequences by means external to itself. The mathematics of the theory, as above indicated, are not entirely free of paradox. So, resolution may only, as it should, be sought in its very principles and assumptions, explicit and implicit, on which the theory is built, and the fact that (as the earlier discussion has shown) they are *not* sufficiently clearly and unambiguously defined from the start.

As regards the actual dilatation or contraction of real clock indications, the fact cannot be made light that so far, time dilatation experiments have conspicuously failed to consider *the real effects of motion on the ultimate internal constitution of "clocks"*, precisely because the theory has neglected to do so also. Without proper consideration of the *real* effects, such measurements *cannot* be regarded as conclusive. Since the clocks themselves are bodies, and as such subject, according to the theory, to relativistic contraction, why should their rates remain unaffected by that contraction? The relativistic time dilatation (now, contraction) is not explicitly within the theory related to the contraction of the clocks themselves. How can it be shown that this is not a *separate* and thus *additional* effect? If this phenomenon is real, only *real* causes produce it. On how exactly this *really* happens the theory is totally silent!

The above are all theoretical matters fully within the spirit of relativity, which, on account of its very nature, may never be possible to be rid entirely of internal conflict and paradox. Only absolute reference can ultimately resolve such issues. However, in the real world, the issues of the real, not perceived, simultaneity of events, of the velocity of light, of the behavior of clocks and bodies etc. *cannot and may not* be regarded separately from the *entire complex of the universal laws* to which the real world is subject. Relativity, in its own way, is not unlike the principle of indeterminacy: They both must be seen only as limitations on the power of physical observers such as ourselves fully to resolve through observation or measurement alone the phenomena they (we) observe. Still, regardless of our opinion, the world does not seem at all uncertain in its own ways, processes, or total behavior. Rather, the fact that it is obviously and

unquestionably constructed, even beyond our limits of resolution, according to strictly applicable *natural, not man made, law* (the existence of G , c and h suffice to prove the point) proves that there is a very great deal hidden away within the complex of natural law than at first glance meets the eye. How complete resolution of these issues obtains within that complex has been demonstrated in detail by Stavropoulos³.

REFERENCES

¹ A. Einstein: "On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies"; as reproduced in English in "The Principle of Relativity", Dover Publ., 1952; p. 35 et seq..

² Ibid., pp. 38 -40.

³ G. P. Stavropoulos: "Principia Physica Universi", published by the author, 1986., Library of Congress Cat No 87-670006, ISBN: 978-960-85044-0-6.

⁴ Ref. 1, p. 46.

⁵ Ibid., p. 43.

⁶ Ibid., p. 48.

⁷ Ibid., p. 49.

⁸ Ibid., pp. 43 -48.

31

Re: PRESS RELEASE/PUBLIC STATEMENT

Editor-in-Chief/Science Editor

April 21, 1987.

Subject:

PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT OF SCIENTIFIC FINDINGS
OF THE GREATEST IMPORTANCE
AND EXPOSURE OF
THEIR ATTEMPTED SUPPRESSION AND COVER-UP

Dear Sirs/Ladies:

I hold degrees from the Tech. Univ. of Athens (1958), the Univ. of Sheffield (1963) and the Univ. of London (Imperial College, 1967), have held post-doctoral positions at the Univ. of Toronto (1968-69) and the Argonne Nat. Laboratory (1969-71), and have worked for many years for the industry, in positions of production and research, basic and applied.

The purpose of this Press Release/Public Statement is to announce the existence of findings of the highest scientific importance, resulting from my private studies since 1974. As my findings, under various unjustified and unjustifiable excuses ranging from unexplained rejections, distortions, evasions, sophistries, or casuistries to contrived silence, have been denied of due process of peer review, which amounts to willful suppression, it is with extreme sorrow that I find it to be my duty also to expose here to the public the names of those known to me who have, to greater or lesser degree, taken part in this continuing, flagrant violation of my own rights as a scientist and of the right of the public to know of my findings.

In face of this highly irregular treatment, I was forced to self publish in 1986 my findings in a book titled "PRINCIPIA PHYSICA UNIVERSI", but decided to postpone announcement of the book to coincide with reviews of it in refereed journals. Copies were submitted to scientific organizations (the National Academy of Sciences—also to the Library of Congress) and journals (the Amer. J. of Physics, Physics Today, Science, Amer. Scientist, Fusion) for review. The librarians' (Mrs. Pangburn and unknown, respectively) and book review editors' (Dr. Romer, Mr. Andersen, Mrs. Livingston, Ms. Caron and Mr.

Cherry, respectively) responses ranged from total silence to transparent excuses, except for Mr. Cherry of Fusion, who promised to publish a review as soon as practicable, and Ms. Caron of Amer. Scientist, who only promised to list the book as received; all other recipients decided neither to publish a review, nor even to list the book as received, in a blatant effort to keep the readership from even knowing in any way at all of its existence.

I was forced to complain most strongly to the directors (Dr. Pouncey of Amherst College, Dr. Koch of the Amer. Inst. of Physics and Messrs. Piel and Carey of the Amer. Assn. for the Advancement of Sciences) of the organizations for which those editors work, openly challenging them and their associates either to produce competent disproof of my findings, or failing that not to participate (or if they did, to explain their participation) in the thus sufficiently ipso facto proven conspiracy to keep my findings from reaching the public. Having received *no* answer to this challenge, I sent copies of the book for competent review by their faculties to Dr. Treiman, Chmn. of the Physics Dept. of Princeton Univ. and Dr. Woolf, Dir. of the Inst. for Advanced Study at Princeton N.J., briefly explaining to them the circumstances of my previous challenge and again clearly requesting that they produce either disproof or some other appropriate comment by April 15, 1987. I also indicated to them that, in case of no reply, I would have to conclude that no competent disproof can be produced. Months have since passed and all deadlines have expired *without* the requested response.

Copies of my book were also sent to individual scholars and professors both in this country and in Europe for their comments. They responded either with total silence, or with angry denial of their moral obligation to disprove my findings or else to acknowledge them, or with mixed praise and reservation. When I fully showed the latter to be baseless and/or careless, the response was again total silence. It is only because I do not desire to embarrass them in public that I shall not here disclose their names. Those already mentioned are fully adequate for the purposes of this Release/Statement.

Thus, in light of these responses, there can only be one logical conclusion: My findings *cannot* be refuted.

Very briefly, my findings, based on a most thorough and painstaking analysis, never before undertaken, of Newton's indisputable law of gravitation, constitute a complete refutation and repudiation of the so-called first law of thermodynamics, of the theory of relativity and of the probabilistic quantum theory as true to Nature, of all notions of relativity and indeterminism as intrinsic to Nature, and of all notions of the Laws of Nature being nothing more than mere human constructs. Further, my findings establish the existence and operation in Nature of completely deterministic, universal Natural Laws of uncompromising strictness, unknown heretofore, imposed as a second, and separate from matter, ingredient of physical reality. These Laws are shown to exhibit characteristics of

indisputably intelligent Design. My analysis shows *conclusively* that neither the Universe as a whole, nor any physical agent within it, could establish and maintain these Laws. In face of these irrefutable findings, there can only be one logical conclusion, namely, that the Laws of Nature are *exclusively* metaphysical, or to be exact, *prephysical* and therefore that they were conceived, introduced, imposed and are still maintained by an extra-universal, conscious and personal Intelligence and Authority. In other words and for the first time, THE EXISTENCE OF GOD IS PROVEN SCIENTIFICALLY, contrary to heretofore opinion that this is impossible. Further, my analysis *proves* that despite the absolute determinism of Nature, human freedom is preserved absolutely intact, which *proves* the objective existence of Moral Law, having binding consequences, regulating all interpersonal relationships. The essence of human freedom consists precisely in freely rejecting or accepting these binding consequences. However, in face of the objective hard facts, the human mind may no longer deny their existence. So to do is to indulge in wishful delusion as never before practiced in the history of civilization.

Hiding these findings, as is being attempted by the aforementioned people despite their inability to refute them, represents therefore by far the most odious act of obscurantism ever so far attempted. Society is hereby asked to consider whether, in so doing, these people, neglecting their solemn promise to seek out the Truth on behalf of us all, attempt to defend a mere school of pseudoscientific thought now demonstrated to be wholly in error, whole lifetimes of useless effort, whole empires of intellectual prestige and economic interest built on the public coffers, or also and far more importantly, the underlying pseudo-philosophy. Because, it is no accident that the notions of struggle for the survival of the fittest under chance, relativity and indeterminism are today ruling the scientific and general thinking. All opposing views have been suppressed and these have been adopted as the means most conducive to undermining the otherwise *undiscountable* value of Man as a moral entity. Once that value is recognized, important and binding consequences follow. These can only be avoided under cover, and “science” has been thought as the surest method of purportedly demonstrating the “unimportance” of moral values and thus of the otherwise insuperable significance of Man as a moral entity. Once that “unimportance” is granted, the issuance of any license at all, except the license to tell the Truth, is guaranteed. So, their silence proves their unwillingness to admit to the, to them most unpleasant, truth that true science proves otherwise.

Before my findings can be detailed, it is necessary to touch on the ideas upon which the search for the ultimate answers is based. We cannot succeed in that search, if we neglect *any* aspect of Nature and Reality. Since the existence of the objective hard facts is undeniable, there also exist equally objective, hard, undeniable, truths pertaining to those facts. Since all objective hard facts exist

together without any conflict, and their sum comprises the Reality that exists, so too the sum of truths pertaining to those facts comprises the Truth that also exists. As there is no internal conflict in Reality, so too there can be no internal conflict in Truth. Such is their true nature that, Reality and Truth cannot be separated. They constitute one indivisible whole. An inseparable characteristic of that whole is also the Logic that applies to them both. Reality, Truth and Logic are fundamentally indistinguishable. To the extent that we doubt the objective existence of Truth, we only demonstrate how imperfectly we understand the true essence of Reality. To the extent that, on general philosophical grounds, we doubt the objective existence of Logic we also violate the fundamental tenet of science being at its best when seeking the very simplest formulation of the Laws of Nature, not “our” laws, that logically best and most economically describes the objective hard facts. An inseparable and indisputable tenet of Logic is the unidirectional flow from cause to effect. In recent times, organized attempts are being made to rewrite the history of ideas and Logic so as to confuse our understanding of this natural logical flow. These attempts, coming under the name “anthropic cosmological principle”, seek to substitute man as the sole cause of all that exists and has preexisted in the Universe for its true Cause that logically can only have preexisted it. That this principle is advanced purportedly in the name of science should not impress anyone. In reality, it is only advanced in order to extricate its proponents from the moral obligation of having, under the irrefutable laws of Logic, to face up to the question of the true Cause of the Universe and of Science. My findings fully expose all this pitiful nonsense.

I shall now present briefly some of my findings.

(a) The problem and mystery of gravitation as a phenomenon of Nature is an inextricable part of that indivisible whole of Reality Truth-Logic that we recognized above. As such, it *cannot* be treated lightly and selectively. It has static as well as dynamic ramifications. Newton’s law of gravitation handles highly successfully both aspects. Einstein’s general relativity, based on arbitrary man-made assumptions, by design can only handle dynamical problems as seen from moving frames. When no relative motion exists, relativity falls silent. Your strenuous effort to lift a very heavy object that you cannot in fact lift involves no motion and so it cannot be treated by relativity. But it does involve the force of your muscles that *you, volitionally*, apply. It is casuistic to ignore, in the name of some *concocted* so-called general principles, the real force of your own muscles, and thus also the real force of gravity, and claim that you have abolished gravity and instead discovered that space and “geometry” dictate that the planets move in such-and-such way, which is what relativity does. Nor is it an accident that relativity left on its own cannot predict anything, but only after it is deliberately

adjusted under additional assumptions to produce at the limit the mere form of Newton's gravitational potential, without however attempting to explain its causes. These undisputable facts demonstrate that Newton's law, besides being far simpler, is a far better candidate as a Natural Law of Gravitation. Close examination of Newton's Law reveals two aspects of it that have been overlooked for three hundred years.

Firstly, that the separation entering Newton's Law is to be measured along a Euclidean straight-line path is a mere human assumption that in no way obliges Nature. When all ramifications are considered, it is clearly seen that only curvilinear paths can physically be traced between bulky bodies in a Universe in which mass is not perfectly smoothly distributed. A curvilinear path determined by the actual mass distribution in the whole Universe is inevitably longer than a straight-line path and allows both Mach's principle to be incorporated into Newton's Law and the precession of perihelia. In juxtaposition, it is known that general relativity does not satisfy the Mach principle despite Einstein's original belief, and that Newton's Law with a straight-line separation does not permit precession.

Secondly, Newton's gravitational constant is basic to the structure of the Universe. Not only does it give a dimensional and thus physical-natural value of proportionality between masses and force identical for all gravitational interactions, it also relates explicitly to the age and volume of the Universe. When the analysis is completed, it is seen clearly that the values of G and the total mass in the Universe are truly constant. As a result, the Universe *has a definite, not infinite, age and it expands*. Its density and radius are dependent explicitly on its age. On the *sufficient* basis of Newton's Law, one concludes that the Universe started expanding from zero volume with an infinite initial velocity that is gradually slowing down. As a result, length is *not* a fundamental dimension of Nature, despite all heretofore accepted scientific dogma. The analysis further shows that there is no massless energy, and so that light is subject to gravitation and that the *variable velocity of expansion is no other than the velocity of light*. Moreover, there is *one and only one value of radial distribution of matter* that permits *a truly Euclidean straight-line path for the propagation of light everywhere in the Universe*, which also guarantees that *its velocity is retarded identically everywhere at the same time*. On the basis of these explicit relationships, the density of matter and the total mass in the Universe are obtained and found to be within one order of magnitude of our best estimates. No more than Newton's Law, the constant value of G and the present values of the age of the Universe and of the velocity of light are used in these calculations.

As a result, the principle of the constancy of the velocity of light and the assumptions of rigid rods and well-behaved clocks, all fundamental even to special relativity, are shown to be totally false despite current dogma. The continual

decrease of the velocity of light demonstrates that the so-called first law of thermodynamics is also false. One can no more doubt these findings than one can doubt one's own ability to walk safely on the planet protected by gravity against being lost into space.

(b) The Michelson-Morley experiment, one of the few most important experiments in science, was first run at the end of the last century to test the ether hypothesis. Its negative outcome was found inexplicable until special relativity came along in 1905. Though Einstein has admitted to not then knowing of the experiment, its outcome and special relativity have since found in its other their mutual justification. However, careful re-examination shows that the traditionally accepted analysis of that experiment *is grossly false*. Carefully analyzed that experiment no longer supports special relativity, but proves that the more complex contraction of all bodies in space is a real deep-seated phenomenon (having absolutely nothing to do with the relativity of motion, or the purported constancy of the velocity of light relative to arbitrarily moving observers but) relating to the constancy of the *absolute* velocity of light in all directions at the same time. This absoluteness relates to the center of the Universe, the existence of which is *sufficiently* demonstrated through Newton's Law of Gravitation and the spherically symmetrical expansion of the Universe. Relative to observers, light too, like all bodies, *has* a relative velocity. Further careful analysis proves that light (ultimately, the fundamental photon), in the *bound state*, is the sole basic ingredient of all material bodies, on account of which alone, it is possible for bodies to suffer the *real* and not merely apparent contractions observed in the Michelson-Morley experiment.

Einstein's definition of simultaneity, on which the whole relativity edifice rests, is conclusively demonstrated to be logically false by a simple extension of his own thought experiment of the train moving along the embankment. However, what is correct in his argument, which also is correct even in the traditional analysis of the Michelson-Morley experiment, is based in fact on the relativity of motion of observer and photon. So, the relativistic statement of the constancy of the velocity of light relative to all observers regardless of their motion is contradictory to Einstein's own earlier assumptions. Logic demands that no contradictory premises be considered together in building a syllogism, and that no conclusion be claimed as disproving the premises on which it is based. Relativity fails these logical tests. All rationalizations of the theory of relativity to date have willfully ignored a thorough examination of all underlying hard facts and of the logic of its premises. This becomes clearer still when one considers that the claimed relativity of time is based on grossly false reasoning (equating lengths of totally different physical significance and size) and that the claimed "unification" of space and time rests solely on Minkowski's equating (in the

same paragraph and a manner that he himself calls “mystic” and “pregnant”) the velocity of light, an unambiguously physical and thus dimensional quantity, to both 1 and the square root of minus 1, which are only mathematical and thus *dimensionless* quantities, which runs in the face of Logic on *both* counts!

When objectively examined, the theory of relativity is found to be logically flawed and superficial, based on false premises and arguments, interested only in the *appearance* of things, *not their true* physical constitution which does not support the theory. All physical facts purportedly explained in obviously contrived manner by relativity can be explained totally without recourse to that theory, on the basis of Newton’s Law of Gravitation. Carefully examined, the hard facts of Nature demonstrate that gravity is not a contrived “geometry” of space but a real physical force sufficiently represented by Newton’s Law.

(c) Optical absorption and emission spectra had been known to possess regularities before the advent of quantum theory, but no theoretical explanation could be given. Also, the atoms had already been conceived as little planetary systems consisting of a positively charged nucleus around which revolved negatively charged electrons. But why the electrons failed to fall onto the nucleus had defied explanation. The Bohr model of the electron presented in 1913 was the first attempt to explain both the spectra and the stability of the atoms. It succeeded in explaining the spectrum of hydrogen and its stability, but failed completely to explain the spectra of more complex atoms. Yet, even in the case of hydrogen, the Bohr model represented a totally *unrealistic* physical picture. According to the model, the atom can only be a dipole, forming as the electron revolves an *extremely thin disk*, *not* a sphere as observed. Moreover, the model claimed that ionization, the removal of the electron from the atom, takes place at an infinite radius of revolution. The obvious cosmological consequences of this claim have been ignored to this day, and how it is possible at all to observe ionization and negative electricity within a finite Universe has never been explained. In the 1920s, the Bohr model was replaced by the highly complex but mathematically successful probabilistic quantum theory developed by Bohr and his school. Still, the physical picture of the atom implied by the theory is no other than that of the physically defective Bohr model, but now all questions on the exact physical happenings inside the so-called electron cloud are ignored under cover of the indeterminacy principle, that attempts to deny us the objective right to pose such questions that *purportedly* even Nature cannot answer. It is *not* accidental that, the mathematical structure of the theory was developed before a satisfactory corresponding physical picture, “interpretation” it is called, could be given. This situation remains unchanged to this day. Strictly speaking, the electron cloud is only a mathematical area thought to extend to spatial infinity within which there is a finite probability that the electron is situated at a particular

point at a particular time. Essentially, all the physical, philosophical and cosmological problems associated with the Bohr model carry over into the current theory that, moreover, flatly denies the existence of simple mathematical expressions for the spectra of all atoms other than hydrogen, as well as the existence of so called “hidden physical variables” giving rise to the picture observed. The grave questions raised by the theory, preeminent among which is the proper place of the “observer” in the physical world, are to this day brushed away in light of its purely mathematical success. But this success is only due to man’s immense prowess to rationalize mathematically ill-understood hard facts of Nature, the objective and therefore logically binding physical significance of which he has consciously so far determined to ignore. With excellent reason, Dirac was not much impressed by this situation and argued that we develop a new, realistic, logically fully satisfactory quantum theory. But to this day, the so-called “standard model” holds absolute sway only because, if this is a representative case, its proponents have deliberately and successfully prevented a proper theory from being developed.

My findings include a physical model of the electron, based on the classical notion of a spherically-symmetrically oscillating spring, that completely eliminates all physical and philosophical questions of the Bohr and current theories, and on which a proper quantum theory can finally be constructed. The “observer” is removed from the picture. Nature is shown to be quantal on its own. The physical spherical nature of the atom is restored; the electron is shown to be a physical spherical shell of atomic yet variable (on account of its oscillation) dimensions, not a quasi-point particle. Ionization is shown to occur at a small finite radius as experimentally observed, *not* at an infinite radius as claimed. The spectra of all (or at least three) atoms are explained on the basis of the same simple expandable mathematical law. All electrons in the atom, in states far from ionization, are shown to possess equal energies. Far from ionization, there are corresponding states in all atoms, in which, electrons possess nearly identical energies. That the Planck constant is the measure of uncertainty was a conclusion based on Bohr’s inadequate conception of the atom. Now, it is shown to be no other than the exacting, universal-age-dependent, universal measure of least action that preserves, within limits, the observed stability of form of all bodies in the Universe. The attempted suppression of these irrefutable findings seeks to hide from the public eye the immense scientific and philosophical significance of all aforementioned hard physical facts.

(d) On the scientific side, my cosmological and quantum findings show that there is an absolute unity in the world carrying from the fundamental particle to very front of the entire expanding Universe. The fundamental particle is at the same time the least massive, yet, geometrically largest particle in existence.

The search for the fundamental particle inside the nucleus is totally misdirected. Accelerators only succeed in packing more and more mass, that is more and more fundamental particles of matter, within a geometrically more and more confined area. They will never succeed in isolating the fundamental particle. In one sense, accelerators only succeed in reconstructing earlier states of matter present in past ages of the Universe, without however making it possible to reproduce the then actual value of the velocity of light, that, being age-dependent, can never be reproduced.

The fundamental scientific importance of these findings calls for an immediate moratorium and re-evaluation of all scientific teachings and all major projects in physical science. There can be no doubt, huge public funds and untold effort is currently expended on pursuits based on grossly false premises. Those misdirecting the effort, or consciously letting it be misdirected, while hiding or ignoring the now obvious and proven falsehood of the currently accepted premises, must be asked to account for their official conduct. Given the sheer magnitude of the public cost involved, the attempted deliberate suppression of my findings, seen as a positive act, is nothing less than a malfeasance, and seen as non-act, a nonfeasance, but in either case, it borders on the criminal.

(e) On the philosophical side and most briefly, my findings constitute the most solid scientific proof that the physical Universe in all scales has been conceived and created and operates on the basis of exact and uncompromising Design, which the analysis demonstrates to be beyond the ability of the Universe to effect on its own. The Design possesses features that are uniquely, unmistakably and inescapably intelligent, thus demonstrating as has never before been possible, the existence of conscious and thus *personal* extra-physical Intelligence, in short, THE EXISTENCE OF GOD. Above anything else, the silence my open challenge has met with proves the inability to controvert this last and greatest of all my findings.

It is my plain humble duty as a scientist and thinker to bring these matters and this entire affair to the attention of my fellow men.

Sincerely,

PRINCIPIA PHYSICA UNIVERSI, by George P. Stavropoulos. XX plus 364 pp. Hard cover, cloth, 24cm × 16cm. Published by the author, 1986. ISBN: 978-960-85044-0-6. Price: US \$80.00. Copies of the book will be sent to reputable reviewers for public review here and overseas. Please contact the author.

This release was sent to at least 37 of the greatest world-wide news organizations and 8 television systems having offices in New York City.

AUTHOR'S COMMENT: There has been no response from any quarters!!!

32

Re: LETTER TO MR. COWEN

Mr. Robert Cowen, Science Editor
THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR
1 Norway Street
Boston, MA 02115

May 6, 1987.

Dear Mr. Cowen:

On April 21, 1987, identical (except for the addressee) and individually signed copies of a Press Release were sent by myself to 45 major news organizations, prominent among which also was the Christian Science Monitor. On the belief that the information given in the 1986-87 Business-to-Business yellow pages for Manhattan was accurate and that there was instant communication between your Boston and New York offices, my letter to the CSM was addressed to 342 Madison Ave. NY, NY. About a week later, I called to determine safe delivery and spoke to Mr. D. Riffert who promised to investigate. Mr. Riffert informed me that even as of yesterday, my letter had not reached the Christian Science Monitor. A signed copy of that Press Release is enclosed herewith.

At the age of 52 and having earned my Ph.D. degree from the Imperial College of Science and Technology of the University of London in 1967, I believe I am a fully responsible individual and scientist. Respecting the good names both of myself and of my teachers, I would never have taken the precipitous step of sending the Press Release unless there were excellent and sufficient reasons. Not one word contained therein, or herein, has been included lightly. I therefore am amazed that the recipients of my Press Release, to the majority of whom I must assume it made it safely, have so far taken no action at all, not even to grace me with a phone call in their effort to determine the veracity of my statements. This is altogether inexplicable in view of the fact that as a last statement in the Press Release, I promised to send copies of my book for review by reputable reviewers. Neither the language, nor the content of the Press Release, nor indeed the offer possibly permit any logical person to conclude that the author is a light-headed individual. What then am I, is one, to conclude? That even the Editors-in-Chief and the Science Editors do not have the slightest interest in developments in thought of fundamental importance but only in the daily trivia? Or that they have decided not to take me up on my offer fearing that I will be proven to

be right? Or that there is a concerted, and pre-agreed upon, conspiracy in Academia and the Press to keep the public in the dark even after the prominent “scientific” theories have been proven to be utterly false???

Mr. Cowen, please permit me to repeat, and intensify here my emphasis on, the veracity of my statements. I have kept a complete record of my correspondence. When my challenge to be proven wrong and my offer of the book for review are not met despite the obvious importance of the subject matter, I am left with no alternative but to conclude that, in the very least, it is intellectual laziness and cowardice that causes academics to react as they so far have done. Professors do not have the right, as my correspondence shows, to claim that they do not have the time to study my book to be persuaded in the one way or the other! What are they being paid for but to cut new paths in knowledge over the most difficult intellectual terrain???

As regards the duties of the Press, I shall leave to you to provide a more authoritative answer. The question is: Will the Christian Science Monitor have the courage to tread where others do not dare???

Very sincerely,

AUTHOR’S COMMENT. Some time after sending this letter, and still having received no response, I called and was told that my fight was only mine and I should fight it alone! It was an honest statement of the “spirit” governing even those posing as religious spiritual leaders of the world. The presentation of this indicative assorted collection of correspondence is intended to show the *true* spirit even of such people! *Scientific proof of the need that there be a Creator does not interest any of them!* For them it suffices that they “lead” people, certainly, as *they do now prove, not con Deo*; and so, to *no* Good End!!!

33

Re: FIRST LETTER TO DR. SAMIOS

Dr. N. P. Samios, Dir.
BROOKHAVEN NAT. LABORATORY
Building 460
Upton, NY 11973

May 7, 1987.

Dear Dr. Samios:

This is an application for employment and a request that you kindly help make my recent, unique and truly revolutionary book "PRINCIPIA PHYSICA UNIVERSI", that is currently being suppressed, known to the scientific and world communities.

I am enclosing herewith my complete résumé, a signed copy of a recent Press Release and a copy of a letter sent to the Christian Science Monitor.

Obviously, I am seeking a position of significant responsibility where my training and theoretical and practical expertise can be put to best use.

As for my book, the Press Release itself provides a sufficient introductory synopsis of its main points in addition to exposing the resistance with which it so far has met. The apparent coldness of the recipients of the Press Release is discussed in my letter to the CSM. Of course, I understand that the materials sent are in themselves insufficient to allow the formation of a complete picture of the detailed substance of the book. I send them to demonstrate the severity of the problem, hoping to excite your personal interest both in the book itself, a copy of which I will gladly place at your disposal, and the goings on about it. To me, and I hope to you too, it is incomprehensible that scientists in high places can attempt to suppress a book and even refuse to admit receipt of a book that they are being challenged to refute but cannot do so. This alone, it appears, testifies conclusively to the importance of the book and its findings and to how injurious these are to the currently established theories.

An additional paper (Item 58 in my list of Publications etc.) analyzing the problem of relativity of time [the one already included in this publication], as inadequately and indeed falsely handled by A. Einstein in his 1905 relativity paper, has still not been responded to. But perhaps this is still not abnormal yet, though I would have thought that the Physical Review is rather expeditious.

As the application for employment is quite separate from the issue of the book, each can be pursued separately. I shall be indebted to you if you order the expeditious investigation of both problems.

Very sincerely,

Re: SECOND LETTER TO DR. SAMIOS

Dr. N. P. Samios, Dir.
BROOKHAVEN NAT. LABORATORY
Building 460
Upton, NY 11973

May 29, 1987.

Dear Dr. Samios:

On May 7, I sent you a very important letter and supportive material in a 12x9 envelope. It is inconceivable that it did not reach you, but it is possible that your response to it may have been lost in the mail.

I cannot overemphasize the importance that I place on your response on both subjects raised in my other letter. I do not doubt that you have found at least the subject relating to my book very disturbing indeed and that you have verified the absolute veracity of my statements by calling some of the people mentioned, some of whom you doubtless know personally. To me, it is totally incomprehensible that you will possibly choose to remain silent as they did. I must for the time being attribute your silence to a mishap or some other very important reason, such as travel or illness.

As to the related matter of my paper "On the Relativity of Clocks", Mrs. Plonski of the Physical Review advised me today (and after my calling them twice and their transparent difficulty of determining the whereabouts of my paper) that, my paper will be returned to me for the *sole* and, bluntly, unbelievable reason (despite the fact that Mrs. Plonski sounded quite sincere) that the AIP *no longer publishes* papers on Relativity and the Foundations of Physics!!! She indicated total inability to advise me as to where I might find periodicals still publishing on these matters!!! If this, along with the silence on my book, is not a most damning self-indictment of the entire AIP network of academic societies and activities, quite honestly, I do not know what it is. Perhaps, you will be kind enough to inform me.

When I wrote to you, I did not do so lightly. You occupy an obviously central position in science. Also, you, as I, carry on the shoulders a heritage second to absolutely none. How is History going to judge us all if my findings cannot be disproven and yet will not be admitted either for transparently "political" reasons??? Quite honestly, I expected you to ask for a copy of my book, for you to form your own independent opinion. I am sorry you have not yet done so.

I do not doubt you will agree that had I been a Jew in the Soviet Union, the treatment I have been receiving would have become the subject of the most vociferous Zionist demonstrations in the “civilized” and “free” West. But I am not a Jew but a Christian and a Greek by birth and in addition I disprove doctrines advanced by Einstein and Bohr who are central to the prestige of Jewry and Zionism. It is probably natural that members of that community and movement who are also members of the scientific community will seek to silence me for clearly non-scientific reasons. But for others, such as yourself, to do so, it is quite literally beyond the pail, specifically as you know my plight due to my unemployment, that is being prolonged as a result of my “impressive background”, “over-education” and “over-qualification” in a field that is dead and can no longer absorb me, but can still absorb far-less-qualified applicants!

I am more sorry than I can express in words for having to be so blunt, but sometimes we humans have to be jolted out of our joints as it were before we decide to do what must be done. I, you know it, am not and can expect no advantage from being impolite. I am trying to be precise. To me, it is incomprehensible that people descended from a long lineage of philosophers can even for a moment consider taking part in suppressing a book of such importance and remain indifferent to the associated human drama. For the time being, and as Logic, History and Judgment look on, my feelings must still be of utter disbelief.

Should you require that we meet personally, I shall make myself available.

Very sincerely,

COMMENT: Dr. Samios never responded.

35

Re: REPLY FROM THE PHYSICAL REVIEW

THE PHYSICAL REVIEW

AND

PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS

EDITORIAL OFFICES -1 RESEARCH ROAD

BOX 1000 - RIDGE, NEWYORK 11961

Telephone (516) 924-5533

Telex Number: 971599

Cable Address: PHYSREV RIDGENY

1 June 1987

Mr. George P. Stavropoulos
3 Renda Place
Green Brook, New Jersey 08812

Dear Dr. Stavropoulos:

We regret to inform you that your manuscript entitled "On the Relativity of Clocks" is not considered suitable for publication in the Physical Review.

Yours sincerely,

D. Nordstrom
Editor
Physical Review D

AUTHOR'S COMMENT: The reader is requested to compare the above statement to that of Mrs. Plonski made to me over the phone, mentioned on p. 147.

36

Re: REQUESTING ASSISTANCE AGAINST RESISTANCE

Dr. Dewey D. Larson
755 NE Royal Court
Portland, OR 97232

July 1, 1987.

Dear Sir:

Dr. G. Bistis, Professor at Drew Univ. and a friend, has advised me to write to you as one who feels that the “establishment” science all too frequently dismisses new ideas without proper regard to their merits. The impression was that you act in unison with other scientists.

I am the author of a truly revolutionary 384-page book called *PRINCIPIA PHYSICA UNIVERSI* of immense importance in science and philosophy. How I, an engineer, succeeded in writing such a book is far less important than the fact that I did write it. Perhaps you will feel less dubious if I tell you that I got my Ph.D. from the Imperial College of Science & Tech. in London in 1967 and that I began working on the ideas in the book in 1974 and only finished it in 1985 and published it in 1986. Without question, the fact that I am an engineer had a very great deal to do with the project, because engineers ask different, concrete, questions and when they do provide answers, their answers are correspondingly concrete.

The question that I asked myself was: **“If I could, how would I build the world?”** An engineer would do himself a disservice if he did not answer: “Elegantly in the extreme”. But this answer automatically involves a *unified* conception of underlying ideas, *a least set of logically interdependent laws, that together supply all that is needed* for the most elegant solution. To an expert eye, an engineered construction tells a great deal about the “laws” that went into making it. I figured that if the physical world has been engineered, a close look into the Laws of Nature [*not* what *we* call “laws” of nature!] would show definitively if these Laws are or are not intelligent. In the context of a least set, *nothing* in it is superfluous or missing. *All* Laws of Nature are either primary members of that set, or derivable from, but *never* in conflict with, the set.

I thus brought myself to look into Newton’s Law of Gravitation (NLG), and two things emerged:

(a) If the Law is basic, how can planetary precession be explained? I realized that precession is precluded only if the separation is measured along an ide-

ally Euclidean straight line. A separation measured along a non-straight line will inevitably be longer than the first, and the actual attractive force, *though still* given by NLG will be smaller than assumed under a straight-line separation, *thus permitting* planetary precession! I also realized that in a universe in which even light is bent by a massive body, a Euclidean straight line is an extreme, limiting case if ever applicable, and a purely non-physical and thus forbidden concept if never applicable. In other words, astronomical evidence *does not* preclude the *strictest* applicability of NLG, while its claimed failure is only due to our grave failure to separate *our assumptions* (as to the true nature of separation) from the *hard facts* of Nature! General relativity theory as a supposed answer *is no longer needed!*

(b) Attention to G showed me that it has the dimensions of (mass density $\times$ time²)⁻¹. If G is not only a “mere” proportionality constant, curiously entering with a singular value all two-body interactions, but a *true universal* (applicable to the *entire* Universe) constant, it must be written as $G = a/DT^2$, where a is a pure number, D is necessarily the average density of matter, and T the age of the Universe. For $a = 1$ and $T = 12$ billion years, $D = 10^{-28}$ g/cm³, too close to the observed value to be a mere coincidence. Since $D = M/V$, the constancy or variability of the quantities G , D , M , V , T places *severe* constraints on how these quantities relate. Out of only eight possibilities, all but one are eliminated. The one remaining is for G and M to be both truly constant. Then $V \approx T^2$. For a spherical Universe, $R \approx T^{2/3}$, $dR/dT \approx T^{-1/3}$, $d^2R/dT^2 = GM/R^2 \approx T^{-4/3}$ leading to $a = (6\pi)^{-1}$ and necessarily to $c = dR/dT$, $D = 5 \times 10^{-30}$ g/cm³, $M = 10^{56}$ g!!! Needless to say, there is a very great deal in the book. But this is already plenty! These relations speak *only of the volume* of the Universe, *not* of space, T is the *universal* measure of time, thereby precluding relativity, energy becomes proportional to $T^{-2/3}$ and therefore *is not* conserved, the laws revealed are awesomely elegant, universally applicable and as I later in the book demonstrate beyond the power of the Universe to devise on its own and impose upon itself! An outside Intelligence is thus demonstrated through the operation of Natural Laws, very much as a suspension bridge speaks of its engineer-creator! Special relativity thus being shown also to be foreign to the structure of the Universe (its purported agreement with the null result of the Michelson Morley experiment is due, as I demonstrate, to gross blunders made in the classical analysis of that experiment), I looked in the direction of quantum mechanics.

And sure enough, I was able to develop a *new, thoroughly classical* model of the electron that produces a modified Rydberg law expandable to *all* atoms. The spectra of H, He, Li (the only three atoms that I have looked) *are* fully explained! All electrons in an atom in states far from ionization have the same energy! All electrons in all atoms in corresponding states far from ionization have very nearly the same energy! There is a simplest and most singular way the

atoms are built of an awesome *designed* simplicity! Needless to say, the principle of indeterminacy is gone. What replaces it is the Law of least action that *strictly regulates all processes*! My model fully answers Dirac's plea for a new *deterministic* quantum theory!

The establishment science has sought to suppress these findings! Hiding behind excuses, deliberate misunderstandings of my statements and silence to my rebuttals and challenges, they would not endorse the manuscript. When I self-published the book, they refused to publish reviews of it, list it as received, give reasons as to why not and they exhibited a total lack of intellectual curiosity to see how I could substantiate my claims! Explicit challenges to the Institute for Advanced Study and the Dept. of Physics of Princeton University (to which I also sent copies of the book in February—Dr. Treiman has yet to acknowledge receipt!!!) to refute my work, or failing that to produce appropriate comment, have been responded to by silence, despite my explicit telling them that, in such a case, I would have to conclude their inability to produce *competent* refutation, and my implicitly suggesting that their silence would be their tacit admission of suppression. A *double* appeal to Dr. Samios, Dir. of the Brookhaven Nat. Lab. to investigate the case has remained unanswered, I must assume, deliberately! Given the importance of my findings and their inability to refute them, this is obscurantism of the grossest magnitude ever attempted!

I am seeking ways to obtain redress, as their acts attempt to deny my findings and myself the deserved recognition and do in fact cause me great professional and economic loss.

I am also seeking help from objective and fair-minded people to bring these findings and matters to the attention of the world public.

A 20-[typed] page paper in which I fully analyze Einstein's 1905 ideas on the relativity of time and in which I show that he reached his conclusion through the gross error of substituting $x_c = vt$ for $x = ct \cos \alpha$ in the Lorentz transformations has been denied publication in the Physical Review. as "unsuitable" (*no* referees' comments). On the phone, Mrs. Plonski advised me to seek out publications still publishing on relativity and the foundations of physics, because the Physical Review is no longer active in these areas!!! I wrote to 17 additional publishers to see if they would accept my paper and book for review, but only one answered back and he would not!

Sir, can you help??? Will you help???

Sincerely,

AUTHOR'S COMMENT: On July 15, 1987, Dr. Larson replied that those who stand with him attempt "to promote understanding of [his] theories [unknown to me] ... and do not undertake to examine other new ideas".

37

Re: BISHOP ANASTASIOS GIANNOULATOS

(Exact translation of the Greek original)

Mr. Anastasios Giannoulatos
Most Beloved of God Bishop of Androusa
33 G. Sepheris St.,
New Psychikon, Athens

July 7, 1987

Most Beloved of God Bishop:

I am addressing you in reference to my book [a copy of which was hand-delivered to you in Dec. 1986.—This note added on assembling this collection of letters]. Contrary to suggestions received before proceeding to have the book printed, I avoided coming to any contacts that would only cause further delays. The contents of the book had already been decided upon. In addition, solely *I* had to carry the full load of my ideas. During the two or three days between book-binding and my departure for the USA, it proved impossible to locate you.

Since my return to the USA in Dec. 1986, I have made a very great deal of effort to obtain its becoming known to the scientific community. It is not necessary to repeat here and tire you with the details of this effort. The substance of it is that I have met with solid silence, signifying, and by the development of facts suggested to be conspiratorial, or in the very least silently agreed to *refusal rather than disbelief*, or else indicative of the inflated haughtiness of the “learned” of these times.

As regards inflated haughtiness, no further word is required. As for doubt based on good faith, it is possible that it be lifted by everyone willing to examine and study the book that I have offered and still offer for that purpose, aiming at obtaining publication of critical reviews of it by responsible specialists. When my offer is rejected despite the obvious gravity, never presented before, of my findings, both scientific and philosophical, every person of good will is well justified to doubt goodwill due to disbelief of the specialists. This as regards those who have not yet seen the book.

Because those who have seen it must be separated in two categories: (a) those who only to make mostly superficial remarks, and remained willfully silent even after the complete reversal of their remarks; and (b) those who re-

mained silent from the start though in full knowledge of the significance of the book and the *open and direct* challenge and declaration on my part that any possible silence on their part could logically be taken as their complete inability to prove erroneous my findings, and the thus connoted suggestion that in that case their silence could only be regarded as identical to a silent concealment of findings of the most major significance! This second category includes scientists of the very highest reputation, directors of colossal scientific organizations as the American Institute of Physics, the Association for the advancement of Sciences, The Institute for Advanced Study (where even Einstein spent so long a time) and the Department of Physics of Princeton University. A *double special* appeal to the director of Brookhaven National Laboratory that he undertake his own examination of the matter remained completely unanswered!

In addition, I have written to a total of *eight* Nobel laureates, of whom some remained completely silent, some said that they “did not have the time”, while one of them that “he did not have the time though the book was interesting”, and one who found my introductory letter interesting, but not and the book itself which he studied for two months, “though it is possible that one or more points escaped [his] notice” and who remained in complete silence when in answering I pointed out to him at least 26 points that had “escaped” him!!!

The objective observer is justified to ask: “Why? And what kind of behavior is this?”, especially in the face of other objective remarks about the quality of the book’s language (“very very well written”) and unquestionable scientific (“product of passion and intellect”, “well thought out”, unique collection of problems still outstanding in science”, “the most well thought out analysis of important points in science”) quality of the book, made by other professors, who however, prefer anonymity and no part in the matter, as it is made obvious from the fact that in no case do they undertake some positive and substantial act of public support, and only privately do they wish me “good luck”!

But whoever is knowledgeable of “things” about science may not be surprised. When even very bad attempted publications are rejected in writing, yet by *unsigned*(!!!) commentaries, their purposeful silence in the face of my open provocation suggests only one thing: as one other professor told me, “[my] book hits them at their most sensitive point”: “Scientific positions” held for centuries are proven completely wind-swept and false. Most central among which is the position that ostensibly the natural world needs to referral to God for its complete understanding, which position has led to the complete interruption of the *few*, at any rate, contacts between the physical sciences based on “proofs” and “theology” ostensibly possible only as a product of pure belief about “things that cannot be proven”!

For the first time in the history of science and theology, the chasm is being bridged by the most immovable scientific and logical syllogisms and arithmetic

proofs, but the ostensibly scientific world remains silent! (One needs only imagine the tumult the atheists would raise, if arguments of equal gravity were ever presented supporting the view of the nonexistence of God!!!). To this so-called “scientific” world I am obliged to include the positivist as well as the theoretical “scientists”: Because explicit and implicit letters and requests of mine addressed to “Christian” universities, scientists and academics did not receive any better treatment at all, while “friendly scientists”, for the sake of atheism and opportunism preferred the silence and abandoned friendship and science! But this way, even the self-serving titles of “scientist “ and “Christian” are placed in complete jeopardy.

It seems to be clear and unavoidable that an effort ought to be made at some time so that the chasm between science and theology be bridged. That this did not happen so far is only due to the fact of the *incontestable need and difficulty* of the special demands that ought to be satisfied by the person prepared to make the necessary effort. In the measure that I managed to satisfy those demands, so also did I write the book. Any demand of mine beyond what was truly accomplished would be impudence unforgivable; while unprotested submission to the silence of those opposed to that bridging would have been an unforgivable abandonment of what I humbly regard to have been a duty entrusted to me to bring to completion. I am obliged to sail safely between these Clashing Rocks!

But this sailing obliges me to demand the attention and the response of all those who have an obligation to mark clearly and publicly their position, taking into account that in the struggle of Light and darkness there are *no* spectators! The Spirit blows where He wills, and now is the time of returning the talent entrusted to me! Who am I to refuse the blowing of the Spirit and the return of its product? Though as ἄνθρωπος much more than as the ass of Balaam was I born into the world, even if only as the ass do I insist on an answer by the “wise” of this world, more than the most will I have contributed, but the talent I fear in no case will I manage to return whole [unless I insist to the bitter end]! And, indeed, who has a right to remain silent while observing; while in him, listening and understanding keep the conscience fully informed? Up to what point may the silence of the “wise” keep in doubt the significance of my findings? Until when may the interested but “no specialist” observer doubt the *purposeful insincerity* of their silence? What is demanded for him to be persuaded of the diabolical cunning of their silence? Is the theologian justified to stand indifferent and away from all this, when the World speaks volumes, as I prove in the book, about the *Logical Need* of the existence of its Creator? Or does he truly have a duty to demand from the “specialists” the public expression of their responsible, *fully argued point by point, and signed* expression of their opinion, so that incontrovertibly, before the world audience, the complete examination of this *great* matter become possible?

Can there be even one Orthodox Christian who may doubt the words of Christ about the last of times? When till now were the times even more than last? How truly large is the blindness of those who shall probably say that “[the moral] things shall be corrected by themselves [without *them* moving a finger]”? When shall we all at last understand that the totally superficial and *empty* optimism of the “politicians”, the “theologians”, and the “scientists” in no wise differs at all from the “optimism” of the first ever temptation in the Garden of Eden??? When at last shall the Christian finally understand that Christ cannot return, to dispense the indispensably needed Justice, before our knowledge of God and His Law and the certainty of His existence be placed beyond every, even “scientific”, doubt, so that no one have the slightest Logical doubt during that terrible and certainly coming Dies Irae? Since the Spirit blows where He wills, and since in the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God and God was the Logos, and since by all thy intellect art thou Man [*if* thou know what is good for thee] to love thy God, how can anyone deny that I tell the Truth about the absolute Logicality of the world and of God and His Justice, *without* first proving *me unOrthodox*? So little faith do we “Christian” scientists and theologians then have after two thousand years of Spiritual Catechism and preparation, so that we may today doubt even the existence of Truth, when the Falsehood now craftily screams and now cunningly keeps silent, yet always carefully tending to its diabolical constant deception?

Is the cultivated man justified to doubt that independently of its *exact* mechanism, the theory of evolution is no more than a pseudo-scientific theory while it insists on the “mechanism”(!) of *pure chance* and the *need for survival for no purpose at all* as the determinant of the evolution and fate of the *living* world? Because, who ever *totally by chance* mixed mud and *by chance* built palaces, or even a *single* hut? What blasphemy is worse than the contention that “God” [whoever He be] used the pure and *without some preexisting Law* most blind chance as an organ, when even professional gamblers play according to the *laws of the statistics*, as they automatically get established according to the *prior and subject to law* construction of the die, or of the deck of cards??? *What*, at last, is the sin against the Spirit, that shall never be forgiven, if it is not the denial of the absolute Logicality of God [that from end to end is led by the Spirit of Truth and absolute Perfection]? If, after the pseudo-scientific declaration that the world does not need God and the introduction of blind chance as governess of the biological world, “science” proceeded to declarations of absolute relativity even against every Logic, and by the introduction of new, empty and wholly *il*Logical mathematical and physical demons and of absolute indeterminacy based on wholly *un*Natural theories that, if true, under the terrible pressure of Logic, lift from the table the existence of the Logical God and so also the absolute *ir*relativity and absolute determinacy even of the Moral Law, what right do Logical

people have to doubt that “science” theologizes? And that it is *not*, as it falsely maintains, independent of theological repercussions??? Especially when hiding behind the “natural” laws it stealthily suggests the non-existence of God? Where are those whose duty is *to perform their duty and demand of it to prove that indeed the “physical” laws do not demand their own Lawgiver?* But if such consequences are Logically unavoidable, and the physical laws correctly analyzed *prove* the complete falsehood of all three large “scientific” theories and of the contention of the ostensibly logical self-sustenance of the physical laws, it follows that the *correct science inescapably demonstrates the existence of God!!!*

I always so far executed my duties, and in the present respect very much more so over a series of many years and at a great and continuing loss. However, it now becomes clear that I, alone, can no longer accomplish anything, in the face of the silence of the “wise” and the voiceless “audience”. In the name and the presence of the Living Great and Terrible God of Truth and Justice, I now have reached the final point of exorcising all those who still truly believe to co-operate. The struggle is *not* for the honors, the glory or the “prizes” of men, though if these are given to those who dispense falsehoods, very much more do they belong to those telling the Truth. The struggle is of the Spirit against the complete darkness that comes before the Dawn. Neither I, nor you, nor anyone has a right to expect miracles and refuse to move even a single finger. Since the Day of the Pentecost, the power of the miracles passed on to the believers. It is ludicrous that *anyone* should expect the atheists willingly to confess their defeat while they continue to be in positions of power!!! [Must the believers acquiesce???

In the name of the Living God I exorcise you to move the mechanism of the Orthodox Church and the existing Orthodox organizations, and if necessary to form a society of Bishops, professors, scientists interested in the problems of science, theology and the moral guidance of men, that are shown to be dependent on each other, and to demand of those insisting on remaining silent, that within a *reasonable not interminable* time, either produce disproof of my findings, or confess their inerrancy, threatening complete revelation of their continued willful, purposeful silence before the world public. The Orthodoxy *must* at very long last lift herself to the position of World Moral leadership, that truly belongs to her. I enclose *examples* of letters composed according to the special cases of the addressees.

You must know that you have to deal with people used to putting on airs, atheists of all sorts silently conducting war against God and Christ, anti-Orthodox of various mixed interests, having nothing to do with existential problems of true Spirituality, who under their professorial and academic serious-looking appearance hide all sorts of intentions and only rarely those befitting a man before God. Not for a moment may the Truth be sacrificed in the face of the *false* politeness of the academic formalities.

You must also believe, at last, in the terrible duty of Orthodoxy, as the singular witness of Christ during these last terrible times. The Orthodoxy is nothing other than the *Correct Faith in the absolute Truth*. Orthodoxy is *not* faith in anything false, regardless of its source. Inaction for the sake of calculation, or the possible fear that the revelation of Truth will perhaps produce ill rather than Good is *tantamount to faithlessness and inseparable from a determined effort to refuse* the proclamation of the Last Gospel of God in witness of all the nations.

If once upon a time, in the purity of our youth we prayed for the preservation of our faith and courage, for His continuing to enlighten us, and if ever we loved Him and swore faith ever purer and brighter in the measure of the Light that He would find proper to bestow on us, then surely now is the time to convert those promises and those oaths to True Coin. Since the Lord came to place the double-cutting Knife of Truth between us, we men must decide whether that was meant to be in collaboration under Him at the lead, or in the interests of the ever easier to choose division that gladdens only the enemy.

I would be a veritable clown standing in the face of Truth, if while she proved to stand against my findings, I stuck by them! What everyone shall be proven by his actions, including his silence, now remains to be determined. Since the Lord ordered that our word be yes for yes and no for no, we, I find, have a duty to deny each other *every* escape route! Let's at last let him who *can* understand *understand all that he must!*

With respect, in the Face of the Lord Christ.

P. S. I composed the specimens of the letters as they would be composed by a sender able to understand quite fully (and) the (technical) content of the book, having complete knowledge of the findings and asking the responsible opinion of the specialists on a possible omission of some substantial detail. By his insistence that a technical explanation be produced on every indication of a mistake, the sender places the addressees under notice that their own statements shall be made subject to the same relentless detailed examination.

The identical letter I suggest that it be sent to Drs. Treiman and Woolf does no harm. Their organizations are entirely separate. I leave the exact determination of the time set for an answer to your judgment.

Certainly, the higher the position of the sender, or the organization in the name of which he acts, the likelier it becomes that an answer shall be produced.

For the sake of your more complete acquaintance with the subject, I enclose copies of my letters sent to Drs. Treiman, Woolf and Samios, the content of the Press Release and of the letter sent to Dr. Cowen. Except for the letter from Dr. Woolf in which he simply acknowledges receipt of what I sent him, which, of course, was no reply to what I asked of him, I have received no other reply.

I also send you a sheet of errata that were impossible to avoid and I despite my repeated efforts failed to catch.

Samples of letters requested to be sent by the Church

Sample Letter A

Professor Thomas Gold
Department of Astronomy
Space Science Building
CORNELL UNIVERSITY
Ithaca, NY 14853-0352 USA

(Month) (Day), 1987.

Dear Professor Gold:

I am writing to you on behalf of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church in ... and its environs, Greece, whose I happen to be the Metropolitan Bishop, on a matter of the highest urgency and importance. If you can find the time to consider this matter with the attention it deserves, my Church and I shall be in your debt.

A 1986 book by Dr. G. P. Stavropoulos titled PRINCIPIA PHYSICA UNIVERSI, and some of the efforts since made by him to make it known to the world scientific community, including his letter to you dated October 1, 1987, have come to our attention. This would not normally be a matter in which we would consider intervening, were it not for the fact that in the above book, after a very long and careful study, the author presents a unique analysis of problems still outstanding in science, philosophy and theology from a totally unexplored viewpoint. If his analysis is correct, his conclusions shall mark a sharp turning point in all, science, philosophy and theology and, it is hoped, will help turn for the better the behavior of man, all of which we trust do not leave you cold.

Specifically interesting to us is Dr. Stavropoulos' contention that we have been very wrong in holding for centuries that science and theology are mutually exclusive and incapable of helping each other solve their own problems. Indeed we are prepared to accept as a most significant turning point in the history of ideas the author's argument that, God's existence can be proven as a matter of fact by the logical method of showing that, the laws of Nature that Dr. Stavropoulos presents and develops are irrefutable as regards their objectivity and at the same time incapable of being established and maintained by the means of the physical world itself. Because, in such a case, Logic inescapably suggests that, the question of a preexisting Author, Creator and Provider for the faultless operation of the natural laws can only be answered affirmatively. We do not need to tell you how crucial it is that Dr. Stavropoulos' argument either be competently

refuted or declared to be valid, there being no other logical option.

We are impressed by Dr. Stavropoulos' statement that on completion of his manuscript, he offered and submitted it for review and publication but remained dissatisfied with the lack of care, objectivity, thoroughness and competence of the responses he got, in view of which, he decided to publish his work on his own. We are impressed that the author both before and after publication sought the opinion of many scientists including eight Nobel laureates. From his writing, the author does not impress us as being careless in his approach, and we take his decision to publish his work on his own, despite the economic risks, as a measure of his frustration with the responses he got and of his own confidence in the validity of his technical analysis.

We have been extremely dismayed to learn that after publication, Dr. Stavropoulos submitted his work to the National Academy of Sciences and several most prominent refereed journals for review, but has been treated most improperly in gross violation of the peer review process, after which, in February 1987, he sent copies of his book to Dr. Treiman and Dr. Woolf in Princeton, NJ for their evaluation, refutation or comment, but was again ignored, as was by Dr. Samios at Brookhaven to whom he appealed twice in May 1987. Dr. Stavropoulos' letter to you of October 1, we understand is only one of his latest and still continuing attempts to interest the world scientific community on this most important matter. So far, we learn, you have not seen it fit to respond, but given your stature, we hope that your own silence is not an integral part of this still developing pattern but has been due to totally different causes and you will finally decide to break it and proceed with a thorough examination of Dr. Stavropoulos' work.

In view of the importance of the subject raised by Dr. Stavropoulos and the mostly silent treatment to which he is being subjected, and in view of the fact that important scientific news spread very fast indeed by word of mouth within the scientific community well before anything can yet appear in print, he has concluded that he is faced with a well orchestrated and widely participated and thus most telling attempt to keep his work from becoming publicly known, despite the inability of the experts to refute his technical findings. If true, this is a most serious charge, as it goes against all commonly understood duties of scientists and thinkers to science, truth and basic human justice. For this reason, we shall put off reaching a conclusion until we hear directly from you also. But in case you too choose to remain silent, we too shall be forced to the same conclusion and to regard both the general silence and yours in particular as sufficient proof of the validity of Dr. Stavropoulos' technical findings.

Unless we receive proof of invalidity of Dr. Stavropoulos' scientific thesis, and in face of certain additional arguments of theological-cosmological nature and irresistible force Dr. Stavropoulos has made, we shall find ourselves obligat-

ed to act and use our very considerable means of communication to expose this whole matter to the attention of the world public. The unprecedented moral decay of society, we find, must be checked and reversed. To this we all owe a hand. People are unwilling to behave according to age-old moral strictures, because they have been imbued with the notions of chance, relativism and indeterminism, which have been transplanted to the moral sphere. Now, Dr. Stavropoulos proves these notions entirely false even within the scientific domain.

Perhaps, once presented with the true facts, reasonable people will be persuaded to reconsider their position on the moral issues. This is a possibility that quite simply we are morally bound not to leave unexplored.

Most sincerely,

Sample Letter B

The full address of Addressee

(Month) (Day), 1987.

Dear Sir:

I am writing you on behalf of[details of the Church on whose behalf this letter is sent, and of the sender's position in it, asked by the Church that he send this letter].

A 1986 book by Dr. G. P. Stavropoulos called PRINCIPIA PHYSICA UNIVERSI has come to our attention. In it, after a very long and careful study, the author presents a unique analysis of problems outstanding in science, philosophy and theology from a totally unexplored viewpoint. If his analysis is correct, his conclusions shall mark a sharp turning point in all, science, philosophy and theology and, it is hoped, will help turn for the better the behavior of mankind.

Specifically interesting to us is Dr. Stavropoulos' contention that we have been very wrong in holding for centuries that science and theology are mutually exclusive and incapable of helping each other solve their own problems. Indeed, we are prepared to accept as a most significant turning point in the history of

ideas the author's argument that, God's existence can be proven as a matter of fact by the logical method of showing that, the laws of Nature that Dr. Stavropoulos presents and develops are irrefutable as regards their objectivity and at the same time incapable of being established and maintained by the means of the physical world itself. Because, in such a case, Logic inescapably suggests that, the question of a preexisting Author, Creator, and Provider for the faultless operation of the natural laws can only be answered affirmatively. We do not need to tell you how crucial it is that Dr. Stavropoulos' argument either be competently refuted or declared as valid.

As we find the author's non-technical, logical, philosophical and theological analysis most compelling, we are inclined to believe that he has not overlooked investigating some fundamental technical matter that, when carefully examined, invalidates his entire thesis. But we need to be absolutely certain, as far as we can be certain, and so, we find ourselves compelled to turn to you for assistance in determining whether or not such oversight has perhaps occurred.

We are satisfied with Dr. Stavropoulos' statement that, on completion of his manuscript, he offered and submitted it for review and publication but was dissatisfied with the lack of care, objectivity, thoroughness and competence of the responses he got, in view of which, he decided to publish his work on his own. We are impressed that the author, both before and after publication, sought the opinion of many scientists including eight Nobel laureates. From his writing, the author does not impress us as being careless in his approach and we take his decision to publish his work on his own, despite the economic risks, as a measure of his frustration with the responses and of his own confidence in the validity of his technical analysis.

We have been extremely dismayed to learn that after publication, Dr. Stavropoulos submitted his work to the Library of Congress, the National Academy of Sciences, and several most prominent refereed journals for review, but after months of waiting in vain for the recipients' responses, he has been treated most improperly, with neither being graced with so much as a "thank you" note, nor, more significantly, even with what the peer review process requires to be well-reasoned written arguments for rejection, and on his calling, merely been told, over the impersonal telephone line, that he should not expect any such, it being the privilege of the recipients to act as they please! Given the seriousness of the subject Dr. Stavropoulos tackles in his book, we find this behavior highly abnormal and join him in protest.

But we have been even more dismayed to learn that Dr. Stavropoulos then sent *you* a copy of his work requesting *your* evaluation and *your* refutation or comments, but you have *not* seen fit to satisfy his request, despite his explicit statement that your silence would have to be interpreted as an admission of inability to produce competent disproof, and his clear insinuation that in that case

your silence would *also* have to be interpreted as a tacit confession of willful suppression of findings of the very first order. Before we too are forced to conclude that this is indeed the case, we request your well-considered response.

We shall appreciate your answering at least the following questions:

(a) We are particularly impressed with the author's compelling argument that if God indeed created the world, He did so in the context of a least set of laws, logically independent of each other yet acting in unison, which laws can be extracted from the physical evidence, and that Newton's law of gravitation is indeed a member of that set. We are impressed with the author's solution of the quandaries (i) of the strictness of Newton's law given the planetary precession, and (ii) the inability of Einstein's general relativity theory to comply with the Mach principle, by means of his proposition of the logically independent *and* needed law of separations, which also seems to belong to the least set and which seems to answer the astronomical reservations regarding Newton's law, while demonstrating the needlessness of general relativity as a means of explaining precession, specifically in view of the latter theory's inability to meet Mach's requirement. Since even light in a Universe of massive bodies does not travel along ideally straight lines, the old notion that the separation in Newton's law of gravitation is along such a line, in the author's view, introduces into physics a clearly non-physical notion that had not so far been recognized as such. We are impressed by the idea that Newton's law can be restored to full rigor by means of Dr. Stavropoulos' law of separations and find it quite natural that a non-physical straight-line separation should fall short of full compliance with observation. Is the author right or wrong in his analysis? If he is wrong, why is he wrong?

(b) The author argues that the quantity G in Newton's law of gravitation is a property characteristic of the entire Universe. On this basis, in a first approximation, on p.43, he produces an average value for the density of matter of about 10^{-28}g/cm^3 , surprisingly close to the value observed. He then proceeds to lay down the logical constraints listed on p. 46 (p. 45 of the electronic edition). In subsequent chapters, he eliminates all but the case of constant G and M . Is he right or wrong? If he is wrong, why is he wrong?

(c) He proceeds to analyze the case of constant G and M in great detail and shows that the Universe expands while in full compliance with Newton's law of gravitation, which remains intact! He shows that the velocity of expansion is variable and he argues that it is no other than the velocity of light. Crucial in these arguments of the author is the concept of universal age, inescapably a singular measure of time. In the author's view, this and the variability of the velocity of light strike at the heart of special relativity theory. Further, he obtains an improved value of the average density of matter (p.61/59) and a value of total matter (p. 78), both indistinguishable from the best astronomical evidence. Is the author right or wrong in all of this? If he is wrong, why is he wrong?

(d) He re-analyzes the Michelson-Morley experiment and finds the traditional analysis grossly in error. The new analysis, he shows, no longer supports special relativity. Is the author right or wrong? If he is wrong, why is he wrong?

(e) The author shows the Hubble law to be compatible with his new conception, he develops his arguments for the radial distribution of matter, the determination of the observer's position in the Universe, a most impressive and conclusive resolution of Olber's paradox, and he produces the direct relation of redshift to the Universal age. Is he right or wrong in all of this? If he is wrong, why is he wrong?

(f) In light of the variability of the velocity of light, the author argues for the untenability of the first law of thermodynamics. He examines the thermodynamics of the expanding Universe at great length and shows it to be compatible with his other findings. Is he right or wrong? If he is wrong, why is he wrong?

(g) The author develops totally novel arguments concerning the concept of time. Later in his book, during his in-depth examination of the origins of natural law, he returns to the preeminence of the age of the Universe as our sole foundation for the concept of time. Dr. Stavropoulos shows that exact laws exist in Nature and that the entire Universe down to the fundamental particle behaves in exact obedience to these laws. These laws are written explicitly in terms of the universal age. Accordingly, the Universe is what it is because a "Clock" operates outside and independently of the Universe. As we cannot affect our own age, so the Universe, the author argues, cannot affect the "Clock" but only obey it. This, we are compelled to conclude, is a most profound idea and, if the author is correct, logically should be definitive as regards the objective existence of Divine Providence, that alone is left to mark, as it were, the age of the Universe and compel the latter to behave in obedience to those explicit laws. Is the author right or wrong? If he is wrong, why is he wrong?

(h) The first and so far only model of the electron in the atom was that developed by Bohr, which, however, failed to meet some serious objections of the classicists. The current quantum theory that superseded the Bohr model was however built on the same basic notions relating to a "practically" point-like electron revolving around the nucleus. Current theory and opinion has it that (i) the Rydberg law applies only to the hydrogen atom, (ii) no analogous simple or complex law exists that gives explicitly the values of the spectral lines of all other atoms, and (iii) the indeterminacy principle prevents full knowledge, logically attainable by *anyone*, as regards the exact goings on inside the atom. Now, Dr. Stavropoulos presents a new model of the electron, fully classical in conception, which (i) answers all objections of the classicists, (ii) produces an expandable Rydberg-like expression applicable to all atoms and (iii) demonstrates that fully deterministic laws do indeed operate inside all atoms. The architecture of the atom revealed by Dr. Stavropoulos' model is indeed of amazing detail and

conforming to a singular conception, that the author proves is not the product of his own insight. The author, as an engineer, concludes that this design can only have been produced by an “Engineer”, that it stretches all gullibility to insist on blind chance as the source of such absolute neatness. Is he right or wrong in all of this? If he is wrong, why is he wrong?

(i) The determinism Dr. Stavropoulos shows existing inside the atom compels him to re-examine the notion of indeterminacy. He finds it false and only due to our earlier (Bohr’s and his school’s) misconception of the atom. Dr. Stavropoulos replaces the principle of indeterminacy by the law of least action that uniformly and strictly applies to all of Nature. As the value of least action, h , is itself dependent upon the universal age, the author argues that no process in the Universe exists that is not strictly regulated by law dependent for its operation upon the Divine Providence. Is he right or wrong? If he is wrong, why is he wrong?

Dr. Stavropoulos presents a new and surprisingly coherent picture of the world. In this picture, notions of relativity and indeterminacy are reduced from their earlier preeminence as presumed fundamental law to the level of optical illusions and logically necessary limitations of measurement. It has not escaped us that the notions of chance, relativity and indeterminacy introduced through the sciences have had a most profound and most deleterious effect upon the morals of society. Where God is “unneeded”, where all is reducible, as is currently argued, to chemistry and physics where chance, relativity and indeterminism rule, it is, as a matter of reason, impossible to avoid the introduction and establishment of even moral relativism and indeterminism. This, we take as already having happened. In this light, Dr. Stavropoulos’ scientific findings, if correct, overthrow not only ill-considered notions so far taken as scientific facts, but also the argument that moral decadence, justified on the basis of moral relativism and indeterminism, is in accord with objective natural facts. As the author argues, on which we fully concur, the natural law is but a kind of “replica” of the absolute moral law. Nothing short of a return to the absolute moral law can stem social moral decay.

In this light, what at first glance may appear to many as a deviation from the accepted norm in the author’s handling of his scientific and theological material in a “mixed” fashion is neither really all that mixed, nor in the least unjustified. Knowing full well his ultimate arguments, the author chose to show the reader from the beginning that his was a totally different kind of work. Indeed, unless the author posited the possibility of total rationality and Design, which science so far has rather unconsciously chosen to ignore, he could not logically proceed with his compelling analysis.

The last two paragraphs will show you even more clearly why we take such great interest in Dr. Stavropoulos’ work, and why we request your opinion, and

if negative, why we request your arguments, on the technical issues mentioned above in (a) through (i). Any additional and/or general comments you care to make will of course be welcomed.

Beyond those he chose to include in his work, Dr. Stavropoulos has made certain additional but purely theological arguments of irresistible force. While others may dismiss such arguments, which is another reason why we do not mention them here, we cannot do so, as we find ourselves obligated to act, expeditiously. If Dr. Stavropoulos' findings cannot be refuted on more general grounds or disproved as regards their scientific rigor, we find ourselves obligated to bring them, and quickly, to the attention of the world community, as our best hope of logically convincing all to help halt and reverse the precipitous moral fall of humanity. On this matter we can no longer procrastinate. It is possible that questions of theologically introduced morality do not concern you. Even so, we trust that questions of objective truth do, for otherwise the entire enterprise of science itself is called into question. We also trust that questions of basic human justice do not leave you cold. In these regards, Dr. Stavropoulos' work must either be definitively refuted or acknowledged as of fundamental importance. Otherwise, the principles of basic scientific and human justice are grossly violated. We trust all these matters will prove of sufficient weight as to require your attention on an absolute priority basis. Considering that you must have been studying Dr. Stavropoulos' book since February, can we expect your response by (Month) (Day), 1987? If you find yourself unable to respond by that date, perhaps you will be kind enough to suggest another reasonable date. Please bear in mind that we really cannot procrastinate. Your procrastination or silence shall bear the full weight charged by Dr. Stavropoulos. We do very much hope that you shall not remain silent.

Most sincerely,

AUTHOR'S COMMENT: The Bishop chose *not* to respond.

Re: MATTERS OF FACT

Prof. N. J. Themelis
Henry Krumb School of Mines
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
New York, NY 10027

October 9, 1987.

Dear Prof. Themelis:

I thank you for your letter of October 5, 1987.

On the “crisis in the mineral industry”, it should not be left unsaid that it was self-inflicted by the “ex-directors and VP-s of research and engineering”, who never really justified research to the top management and never took the lead in preparing for the future, but only waited to be asked to “fix”, rather than really solve, mostly petty problems, just beyond the local expertise, cropping up in the ill-maintained and outdated plants. Because of such reactive attitude and the deliberate cultivation by these same people of the false notion that research was a “service” rather than a “production” [i.e., preparing for the future!], it was only a matter of time before it was “seen” that research departments were not cost-effective. Research directors really mismanaged research and mostly frittered away valuable time, money and human potential. I *know* of research mid-managers falling asleep on their desks or playing the stock market. These people have no right to complain.

The current leaders must be re-educated in the appreciation of research. The “crisis” will not be overcome in the stock market, or by the ever over-spending consumer, but in the re-opened corporate research labs, where alone new but unglamorous reduced-cost production processes can be developed, that will justify the research cost by means of the reduced-cost differential. Foreigners have outdistanced us solely because they never forgot this, nor that metallurgy *is really hard work at all levels*.

I do not mention these to argue with you, but only to suggest that, by default, it falls on the professors now to do the re-educating. Unless they do so, they too will become superfluous as new graduates find themselves unemployable and cheated by false promises. Blaming it all on the “crisis” and patronizing all the way will not solve anything.

As for my book, I will be indebted to you if you really succeed to persuade your friend to become interested. I do not think that the authorities have not re-

sponded because they do not want to hurt my feelings, which you suggest as a possibility. Because, I have challenged them to *refute me* and in so doing I have made myself such a “pest” (this letter will give you some idea) as to give them great pleasure to put me out of my delusions. Enough “authorities” have already *seen* my work and *been* unable to refute it as well as unwilling to say so publicly, as to make the silence of those who have chosen not to respond at all far more likely due to conceit and inability rather than kindness.

It is not so much the mathematics *within* the theories but the *misuse* of the mathematics on insufficiently understood phenomena and the *fallacy* of the injudiciously accepted premises of the theories that I expose. It is unpardonable to dismiss new ideas sans voir. Forgive me if I protest that thinking is not anyone’s monopoly; believing that it is betrays unwisdom [to challenge faulty, misunderstood, supposed “facts”]. There is nothing in the present theories to suggest that they will pass the test of time. The “experts” should know this better than anyone. In 1905, the authorities did not understand relativity, yet they did not suppress Einstein’s paper! Our own times are as notable for great “knowledge” in high places as they are for suppression of an opposite point of view, pettiness, conceit, unwisdom and unkindness. After my having “annoyingly” sought and NOT found refutation, is it tenable to believe that the silence denotes kindness? Is it kind, or wise, to leave someone in his delusions rather than graciously put him out of them??? I have been *told* that “the professors are wrathful at me for their inability to understand by book”. I do not believe it for a moment, not least because it is a much worse indictment. If they really are wrathful, it can only be because I, an “outsider”, *prove* my point and they cannot disprove it.

I do very much hope that your friend will find it in his heart to deliver the gracious coup de grâce, if he can. And if he cannot, that he will find therein the courage to go public.

Very sincerely,

N. B. There has been no response.

39

**Re: LETTER TO
BISHOP AUGUSTINE KANTIOS**

(Exact translation of the Greek original)

Mr. Augustine Kantios
Most Reverend Metropolitan Bishop
Florina, Greece

October 30, 1987

Most Reverend Bishop, may you ever rejoice in the Lord,

I wish from the heart that the Lord keep you in full health, so that in full strength you keep on struggling for the sake of Truth. Because today, nothing more than It is demanded, as the falsehood is overflowing and the faith in the Lord of most people has indeed cooled. Although those so cooled today constitute the majority, call "fanatics" those insisting on Truth, and in all manner seek to neutralize the work of the Truth-seekers, the latter continue to have the sacred duty to keep on proclaiming the Truth, the Gospel of the Kingdom all over the Earth in witness of all nations, so that *nobody* be finally found who shall honestly say that he never heard the Truth proclaimed and proven, as only then may the End come. Because the blasphemy against the Lord has so overgrown and the faithful can no longer bear hearing it, they incessantly wish that the End do finally speedily come, so that the blasphemy ignominiously terminate that much sooner; that indeed *cannot* happen before the possibility be removed of even one that may claim that he never heard of the Truth! So, there is still much that remains to be done, including the need of your voice and example. So, I beg of you that you regard me as a co-worker.

I fear, and I write this with the greatest sorrow, that the cold has reached even the episcopal grade within the Orthodox Church in Greece, as it is shown by the great effort (including this one), that I have undertaken as a duty, in pursuit of which I found it necessary to seek the help of a widely known bishop there whom in my youth I had as a group leader in Sunday School, whose total silence I bear for many months already despite my clearest statement *and* proof that a possible silence over the present matter may only come from the evil side, as procrastinating the blasphemy against the Lord and the loss of ever more souls, since never before had the blasphemy overgrown its present level and never before were souls lost as are at the present rate. When other people, pro-

fessors, academicians, scientists of great repute, still wrongly called “spiritual leaders”, but now even bishops remain indifferent in the face of the present spiritual situation, it is now clear that we already spend the last Times as so accurately described so long ago. Of course, you since long ago have stated the present condition and continue the struggle. But now, when the faithful cannot trust even renowned Church bishops, the size of your own many-sided effort is getting ever clearer, as is the preciousness of your time. As also is the need of collaboration and coordination of the work of the faithful. For this reason, and because my own efforts are of the greatest possible significance, I hope you will not attempt to save time, but rather continue to read this letter and to rejoice that the Lord has chosen our days as the beginning of the Last of Times, before the cold freezes even the last remaining faithful, so that you act as the outstanding matters suggest for the completion of the work still remaining to be done.

Although in appearance the remaining genuine Orthodoxy today is in retreat, it also remains the only true Church of the Lord, and the only all powerful, because the true strength is not on the side of numbers but remains with the Lord, and only from His strength is it still possible to flow waters of true wisdom, such as the Holy Spirit judges that are still needed to be presented to the world, to reanimate, and give joy to, the faithful, and destroy the falsehoods of the so many varied faithless before the End comes. Because today as never before, it becomes clear that the work of the Holy Spirit regarding the human race is *not* yet complete, as so many pseudo-Christes and pseudo-prophets have appeared that even a well-meaning person is objectively at a loss to distinguish where the Truth lies; as much of the salt has gone bad and most of the people have not been taught and have not by themselves developed the spiritual capacity to seek and find the Truth! So, because now more than ever has the work of the Devil grown so great that even the existence of God and so too of His Will are found in doubt in the souls of the many, on account even of the many basic “scientific” findings of atheist “scientists”, now too the need becomes greatest that the existence of God and of His Will be proven before all nations, as has *not yet* been done. Exactly because this has not yet been done, and because the need that it be done is now Logical, because *it is not just* that a soul be condemned solely for the doubt raised in it by the teachings of atheists, but only because it *knew the Truth and willingly decided to ignore it*, for these reasons do I say the the Work of the Holy Spirit among men is not yet complete, *yet awaits us, the still remaining faithful* to bring it to completion! But even this is now ante portas, and if the atheists did not maniacally resisted the well-meaning efforts, it would already have been shown to all men, and you would not hear of it for the first time by this letter. But before I enter the details, it is necessary to recall some of the history of the formation of the Orthodox Christian dogma.

Because “[we] believe in one God, Father, AllHolder-Almighty, Maker of

Heaven and Earth, and of everything visible and invisible". The order of these words has not been accidental: First, we call Him Father, and so, at least by cause of love having brought into being and having created all that He did. Second, we call Him AllHolder-Almighty, and so by Law holding and supporting what He created. Third, we call Him Maker, and so *from within Himself reasoning and acting fully* Maker of everything. But also, we believe that *we must by all of our intellect* love Him, on the word of the Lord Christ. And our intellect, a gift divine and "mysterious" come to us directly from the Intellect of God asks: In what manner does God hold everything under Law, and in what manner did He create everything *within Reason*? By thus asking we enter the deepest question of the wisdom and of the creative mechanism by which the Lord God ἐσοφίσθη (*in Wisdom first imagined and then worked out the fullest inner details of what He imagined*), then created and then ever since supports the entire World. If we see the problem of the Birth (of the Lord) and of the Creation (of the rest of the World) only as a question and product of Love, we overlook and ignore the problems of the full Logic, Prudence, Wisdom, and Omnipower of God, and as a result, I suspect, we blaspheme God, because in this manner we present ourselves as regarding Him capable of *lesser* abilities (only some, thus *blind*, Love and *not also and inseparably of the equally necessary*, Logos-Reason, Prudence, Wisdom and Almightyness). Certainly, as regards the inner constitution of the Holy Trinity and of the creation of the rest of the spiritual world, we cannot say anything at all based on the first article of the Creed, and must rely solely on what the Lord Christ revealed; as *incompletely* written down in the Gospels. Because by the second article of the Creed, we are already in very deep waters, as the Lord Christ is depicted as an *entirely second* Person, in the *very same sense that we are separate persons from our physical fathers!* And as birth *inescapably implies a state of affairs before birth and a state of affairs after birth*, the additional statement that the Lord Christ was born before all ages rather *confuses* the issue instead of *totally clearing* it up: birth before all ages is *not* another expression for ἄδιος (the one who *never* had a beginning, who thus *always* existed, and thus *belongs in a category of being in which he alone belongs*). Our misconception of God is completed in the eighth article of the Creed added in the second ecumenical synod, that depicted the Holy Spirit as a distinct *third* Person sent here and there to advise, remind etc., but does *not in the least* explain why the sin against It shall *never* be forgiven! This confusion in/of the Church's "understanding" of the Holy Trinity (based on the Church's effort to see herself as a natural continuation of *totally unclear* Jewish beliefs and the Lord Christ as the Messiah, whose exact relationship to the Lord God the Jews *never* cleared up and still continue to see him as *totally separate* from God), has *not* been without the most damaging historical misunderstandings of the Deity, and the reservations to Christian Faith some well-meaning atheists choose to

hold. For it is clear that, each of the three Persons seen strictly in itself *is* incomplete: E.g., the Holy Spirit is said just to emanate from the Father, but *not* to inspire Him from within too, and the Son is said to have created the world, implying that without the Son the Father could *not* have created anything! The understanding of the Lord God *is fully resolved and all objections are removed* when He is understood as *One Wholesome* ἑΑίδιον Person possessing *inseparably all three functions* of *Perfect Reasoning, Acting and Self-Inspiration* (which the traditional view has seen as distinct Persons, rather than as *intrinsically inseparable functions of just one Person*! The Church has *not* learned even from the observation of ourselves, even as she holds that we are made up in the Lord God's image and likeness: Each one of us *is just one person, capable of all three: reasoning, acting, and self-inspiration*, which however she denies to the Lord God as *One Wholesome Complete Perfect Person!!!*) So, the Church has not asked herself to what end does the Lord God inspire even Himself, that cannot be other than toward Absolute Perfection that is nothing other than Absolute Good and Holiness, to which He calls even us; which, however, is *not* donated for nothing but is *earned by our conscious effort including the full involvement of our self-cultivated intellect*! How short of it all we historically have been does not need detailed discussion: it is self-evident!

In light of the above, the matters that concern us *and* the objective material world are now posed in an *entirely different* manner: The existence of the material world presents the problem of its *complete, detailed, Logical, prudent, and wise Design*; and it the problem of our science as a *witness* of that Design, and through it the question of its *Designer*! How the significance of this entirely Logical series has so far escaped detailed studying and analysis, I as a positivist scientist/engineer [because whatever an engineer creates demands *diligent complete thought and a detailed design that must be followed faithfully, of else the product shall not be safe*] am unable to explain, except as due to our *deliberate decision to dismiss* the Lord Christ's request that we love our God with *all* our Intellect also! Because we believe we "fell" as a result of the first temptation, *misunderstood* as having entered through the function of matter, even though *temptation is solely a spiritual matter*, we found it expedient to charge the *innocent* for *our* own faults! So, did/do the "Christians" get scared of matter and avoid to think about it both Logically and ethically, as they ought, since they accept it as a creation of God! They do *not* see the blasphemy they thus commit of mutely charging the Lord with extreme maliciousness for asking of us holiness while having placed us in the middle of temptation surrounding us all over! The Asiatic roots of the "Christians" did *not* permit from the beginning to see God in/ as a *true and perfect benevolent Spirit*! Still, sensing the blasphemy, they mutely also tend to see matter as a product or instrument of the Devil, thus unworthy of their *close attention and diligent TheoLogical study* (though they use it and mis-

use it to the utmost)! Which, however, is an *un*Orthodox dogma for one believing the entire world as divine creation supported and cared for by God! In this manner, pseudo-Neo-platonic dogmas and “Christian” fears collaborated, the Christians fell under the spell of misunderstood *spiritual* temptation and ignored the *huge meaning of matter as a creation* of God and its *Logically and scientifically irremovable witness* of its Creator (to the extent that even learned bishops of the Church state that the existence of God cannot be proven)! So was the study of matter (an *irremovable part of objective Truth established by God*) abandoned by the faithful, and in time gotten grabbed by the atheists who use it as a weapon against its Creator while the so-called “Christians” *pretend* disinterest, having become unable to comprehend what *they themselves* have wrought!

Now, it *is* clear even to those following the scientific activities from the distance that the study of matter has been replaced by the study of purely human and wholly arbitrary theories seeking acceptance that are based solely on *arbitrarily selected and falsely interpreted partial witnessing* of the material world, and *not* on the complete witness of matter. *So* have we reached in the establishment of the theories of evolution of the biological world (as a product of chance and the blind and egotistical struggle for the domination of the stronger, independently of the legality of means, since the only recognized law is the domination in all manner possible), of relativity (refusing the objective and absolute ordering of material objects in space and time; and so, *secretly* refusing the existence of Creation by Design, in which the absolute placement in space and time *is* logically necessary, and now spreading in all sectors of human reasoning, thus having canceled even the age-old moral law once thought to be inviolate for its uniformity as having come to the consciences of men directly from God), and of quantal indeterminacy (refusing the complete determinacy of the fully detailed construction of the material world, insisting on the statistics of blind chance in the functioning of the world of matter and the claimed as “necessary” human intellect for its understanding, without which intellect the material world remains incomprehensible, thus canceling even the order of cause and effect on which the entire Logic is based, since before the appearance of man the world is claimed to have been totally haphazard, lawless and meaningless). The sum total of science is today believed to have been based on these three theories, which have greatly affected all the human activities by means of the inescapable “philosophical” osmosis. Pity the scientist who shall dare today object to those three theories!!! But it is now clear that all these theories, basically, *deny* the existence of God, because they deny the existence of a basic, complete, wholly detailed Design that overlooked nothing, on the basis alone of which God could possibly conceive, construct and then support the material world, in full Logic, Prudence and Wisdom. The Christians abandoned the correct consideration of matter and here before us we now have the results!:- The consideration of matter was under-

taken by the atheists and set to serve their purposes. God is profaned and the magnitude of profanity (the exact same unforgivable sin against the Holy Spirit, attempting to set in doubt the Absolute Logicality of the Lord God) is not recognized. Man is tossed about here and there by the “wise” of our epoch, who alone are able to conceive a profanity of such magnitude, seeking for the sake of their own glorification and enrichment the transfer of war and its means even to space, after having exhausted the Earth, seemingly for the “safety” of man in case the war turns nuclear, but in substance for the sake of his moral exhaustion, to the service of which all these immoral activities aim. Souls *are* lost. The “intellectual” and “spiritual” world is kept silent, if they do not serve without the slightest reservation all these satanic designs. The Churches consume their time on other designs and remain indifferent despite the clear command of the Holy Spirit, and refuse to challenge openly all this provocation, more perverse than which the world has never before seen! God cannot interfere and call the End, on account of His love for the well-meaning who are swept by the current yet are unable to determine the situation based on their own spiritual means, in order that He not condemn them unjustly even on suspicion, judging that there is still time for holiness in the midst of all this unholiness, and waits for the faithful to present the irrefutable witness of the soulless material world of its own Creator, the witness that no materialist and no atheist shall be able to refute in the name of science. The witness, already provided is prevented by the “wise” to become universally known. And an internationally known bishop of the Greek Orthodox Church, asked to contact the “wise” and demand that they take a clear position on the validity of the witness presented, remains indifferent and inactive, obviously in order that he not displease them, while souls are lost and the Holy Spirit is profaned!

Most Reverent, I request your attention and care for my effort that calls for your involvement in it. I have already asked by brother in Athens [full name and address given] to send you a copy of my book that I produced entirely on my own following the entirely unjustified stance of the “specialists” whom I begged and challenged either to reject by findings if that were possible, which they could not do, or to suggest its immediate publication here, as they had a scientific duty to do, that they also avoided doing in order that they not be forced to abandon their atheistic beliefs. My book contains the first, even if not entirely complete, yet at any rate *sufficient* in number and *crushing* in significance elements (Logical, mathematical, scientific, numerical) constituting beyond all objections the foundation of the direct witness of the material world regarding the existence of a fully comprehensive Design of Creation, in which *nothing* had been overlooked, according to which the *extra-material* Creator created the material world, that also demonstrated the gross errors contained in the currently held theoretical-“scientific” beliefs. My own efforts to make the book known since its publication have remained without effect on account of the refusal of

the internationally established “scientific” organizations to recognize its existence and the gross silence of the “specialists”, suggesting at least the *unwise* inflated arrogance of the “wise”, if not also their conspiratorial stance on the matter. The provocation is clear: Either my findings are totally false, in which case they must be proven as such by the “specialists”, which is easy to do if my findings are false and they are *true* specialists, or in the face of inability of such demonstration, my findings are *not* false, in which case they *must* be subjected to an open public discussion and recognition by the scientists all over the world. The “specialists” remain silent for the most part, or pretend disinterest and refuse to act in either the one or the other direction. Their inability and refusal, thus ipso facto, suggests the colossal significance of my findings. Indicatively, I enclose herewith copies of letters sent to four addressees who fully ignored the challenge. Of course, me as “unknown” (according to the Lord “νῆπιον”—an infant, baby or child) they may ignore, for I possess no other means of attracting public attention in the face of their conspiratorial silence. It remains to be demonstrated whether these “specialists” or others will continue to disdain those also who possess wide means of attracting the public attention just as they do, which you too possess as a Metropolitan Bishop of the Church (that is, a canonically independent spiritual body equivalent to every other such Church) able by word of mouth, the press, and correspondence with the sister Churches to make known quickly to all the world whatever you will. (A year ago, a simple publication in some inconspicuous newspaper in Lebanon was sufficient to produce a great tumult and shake even the American Government! This alone suffices to show how quickly the Truth can spread, if people exist having the means to call the attention of the world). If they ignore even you, they shall have shown the truthfulness of my findings, in which case the duty of the faithful is more than clear. I enclose herewith samples of my letters addressed to some such addressees. If you so desire, you do not have to do any other than order their most careful copying on formal metropolitan or other paper, sign them in the name of the Church under your care and send them off. The Lord shall show us what more shall be necessary to be done.

It would probably be enough to stop here. But I think I must still add some more thoughts. I think that all I have already developed about the Logical need for the existence of a Design for the Creation of the World (and *only thus also* of the Science that supports it) are by themselves sufficient and completely Orthodox, even as they may at first sight surprise some people, but only because we still have not learned to love God with *all our intellect also* as we ought to have done since the beginning. So, it is clear that we ought to have made the effort to bridge the chasm that exists between “theology” and “science”, that have till now been regarded as mutually exclusive, even as they *are* truly inseparable. That this had not so far been done was due to the reason that I already presented; per-

haps also to the fact of the inescapable need and difficulty of the special demands that the person attempting this effort had to satisfy: sufficient equipment in Science, in Logic, in Faith, in tireless perseverance before a ground never stepped on before. In this regard, it is clear that *only an Orthodox person* could possibly satisfy these qualifications. In the measure that I managed to satisfy all these demands through the enlightenment of the Lord God, as by myself alone I would manage nothing of all these together, in that same measure did I write the book. Whatever demand I make beyond what I managed through the assistance of the Lord would be impudence unforgivable. But also, in the face of the heavy weight that the Lord so placed on me, my unprotested obedience to the obviously tuned silence of the “specialists” and all the rest who do have a duty to make a stand for or against would be an unforgivable dereliction of duty. I am obliged to steer my boat safely between these Clashing Rocks.

This navigation has obliged me since 1974 to make important sacrifices, deposit a very substantial effort and expenditures, abandon the pursuit of a better positioning in my primary field of science, and suffer a terrible spiritual agony. It has also cost me friendships as friends-scientists on account of atheism and opportunism preferred the silence and abandoned both friendship and science. Despite all these I do not feel having a right or an obligation to abandon the effort and drown at sea. I have a *duty* to demand the attention, the assistance and the substantiated opposite argument of all those who have a duty (whether they be scientists or theologians) to make a stand, taking in mind the hard fact that in the struggle of Light against the darkness there are no spectators, because there is *no* objective ground on which man can stand as a spectator! The Spirit goes where He will. How could I refuse being swept by Him? And here now is the time of paying back my talent! How can I refuse to return it? And for all that, and because as a man rather more than the ass of Balaam was I born into the world, and if I only act as the ass insisting on a meaningful response from the “wise” and “powerful”, and thus rather more will I have contributed than those choosing the silence, I fear that I may not be able to return that talent whole! My failure so far to obtain the scientifically and Logically ordained response of the “wise” suggests my inability to return that talent whole, despite the effort. But in this manner, the Divine Justice is being obstructed to act according to Her own will! [If I feel so, how indeed must those feel who choose to remain silent?]

Who then is justified to remain a silent onlooker while hearing and seeing keep on pricking the conscience? Up to what point may their silence place in doubt the significance of my findings? Until when may somebody feel justified to doubt the audacity of their silence in the face of the significance of the problem? What is needed for the “spectator” to be persuaded of the *guilty* audacity of the silence? Is the “theologian” justified to stand indifferent in the distance, while the physical-natural-“material” world by its own hard facts demonstrates

the Logical need for the existence of its Creator, as for the first time is now proven? Is there not a most pertinent duty for a top “Theologian” to demand from the “experts” the public expression of their considered, substantiated and signed opinion, so that dutifully before the world public the full examination of the subject be given a final hearing? These questions have already been placed under the eyes of the other Bishop. The Truth orders that they be put here too. Your own struggle over so many years suggests that here at long last they shall find the attention they deserve, since you know all too well that things shall *not* get better by themselves, as this optimism of the politicians, the “scientists”, the “theologians” *is* false, superficial and *empty*, since in no way is it at all different from the “optimism” of the first temptation in the garden of Eden.

Nobody may doubt that the atheist and thus *false* science of the present day *theologizes negatively and in excess, despite all the false and unstudied or willful remonstrations of its carriers, that ostensibly it remains clear of the theological problem*. Till now, nobody had the courage or ever thought to question it to prove that the natural laws do not demand and do not suggest their own *prior* Lawgiver. If the objective natural world so poses the problems that TheoLogY and Science not be independent of each other (which independence was till now identified with the tacit admission of the atheistic position), it follows that the true Science is obligated *according to Logic* to admit the existence of God both as the Creator of the world and of the natural law according to which the world functions. But the faithful may not expect that the atheists will on their own ever confess this willingly, while they can still hide in their high and arrogant positions of power in this world. Such a miracle without our own willingness to move a finger, we may not expect. You know all too well indeed that since the Day of the Pentecost, the power to perform miracles passed to the faithful in the measure of their own true faith. It follows that victory belongs in their faith, and defeat in their faithlessness. So that in the measure of our faith do we have the duty to engage the atheists in an open dialogue. I, alone, did all I could, and even so, despite all my continuing efforts, it seems that I cannot extract from the powerful their admission that they continue to teach falsehoods and to be paid for them. For this reason do I now seek your intervention.

It is necessary for you to understand the significance of the fact that all high positions of science are today mostly if not entirely possessed by people of inflated self-importance, antiOrthodoc, atheists, Jews maniacally fighting against God and Christ, Zionists, Free Masons etc. etc., of various and mixed interests, not in the least interested about spiritual-existential problems that question the present kingdom of evil in which they are princes and kings, and of which they *unlawfully* reap the goods exactly in the manner of the tenders of the vineyard, who under the serious-looking professorial and academic façade hide every other than a disposition for good, since it is from the universities and under their

permission and blessing that today emanates every idea tuned to perform ever greater evil. Not for a moment is it allowed us to sacrifice the Truth for the sake of the false politeness of the accepted academic formalities. For this reason, no weakness or doubt may be allowed to interfere in the handling of this matter, and their possible refusal to answer your plea must be made clear to them that it shall totally free your own hand. Kindly note that Einstein taught in Princeton University, but he was also a member of the Institute for Advanced Study (where also Bohr worked for some time) which constitutes an organization independent from the University. The identity of the letters to be sent to Drs. Treiman and Woolf does no harm. I leave the exact determination of the time limit set in these letters for their answers to your discretion. Beyond the answer of Dr. Woolf that he received the material from me, a copy of which I enclose herewith, I have received no other response.

I composed two patterns of the letters that I request to be sent as they would be composed by a sender understanding fully the technical subject matter of the book, and having full knowledge of the findings and their significance, and requesting the specialists on a possible omission of examination of some substantial detail. By the insistence of the sender that technical justification be produced regarding each statement of a possible error, the addressees are set on notice that their own statements also shall be subjected to the same detailed examination and control, and that the sender (namely, in this case, you) shall not be satisfied to receive as an answer generalities, unsubstantiated statements, and such banalities as “today, all the specialists are satisfied that the presently theories accepted suffice ...”, as they truly suffice not in the least, because they contain gross unbridgeable Logical chasms and “scientific” blunders at their foundations (as it is proven in my book) and they are very much less precise and certain than has been presented by their inventors and their atheist fellow travelers. As for the rest, the patterns of letters speak for themselves.

I also enclose a sheet of errata that unfortunately proved impossible for me to catch while the book was finally set in Athens.

I remain in deep respect

AUTHOR'S COMMENT: *Neither* this Bishop chose to respond.

Re: SECOND LETTER TO DR. PENZIAS

Dr. Arno Penzias, V.P.,
BELL LABORATORIES,
600 Mountain Ave.,
Murray Hill, NJ 07974

February 4, 1988.

Dear Dr. Penzias,

I hope you will recall my letter of Oct. 22, 1985 and your reply of Oct. 28, 1985. I tried then to read the lines and between the lines and I thought I discerned a distinct impatience. If I misjudged, please accept my apologies. At any rate, I wrote to Prof. Segal and after a considerable period of time received some reprints of his, but no word. His work and mine are totally different. In time, I became persuaded that my work had never before been done and was meeting with resistance only because of its novelty and revolutionary character. I decided to wait no longer and met the cost of publication out of my own pocket.

Since December 1986, I have made extraordinary efforts to obtain reviews and comments, either refuting or accepting, for there is no middle ground, from the most eligible scientific journals, top-notch professors and institution directors. I have indicated our general and individual responsibility to honor, accept and proclaim the Truth. I have indicated that I am seeking just one individual scientist sufficiently secure in himself to disprove my work, or if he cannot do so courageous enough to say so and let the chips fall where they may. I have met with the thickest silence imaginable. One outspoken full professor of physics, having his own reservations about the truthfulness of the current assumptions, who prepared a most favorable review and was ready to expose the whole matter, has had undeserved difficulties with his contract despite his very long tenure and approaching retirement, and has been unable to publish his review, because the journal that commissioned it has been forced closed for anything but scientific reasons.

When scientists are challenged in the name of science to meet a new challenge, should they be contemptuous of the challenger for his obscurity (for who was not "obscure" before he was "recognized"?) and disdain the challenge in silence, or should they rise to the challenge itself? When the full implications of the law of gravity have never before been studied, now that they are studied, must they be pushed under the rug because they disprove the assumptions made

in ignorance of them? When the law of gravity requires expansion and a variable velocity of light, is this something that can honorably be kept hidden? When the Michelson-Morley experiment is re-examined, its traditional analysis demolished and its new and correct analysis shown to be non-supporting of relativity, is this something that does honor to scientists remaining silent? When an *additional* paper shows that Einstein's 1905 arguments on the relativity of time are flagrantly illogical, is it scientific to reject its publication on the sole editorial grounds that it is not "suitable" because "the Physical Review no longer publishes papers on relativity", on account of which, "rejection does not bear on the quality itself of the paper, which was not sent out for review", yet was sat upon for two whole months until I called??? When Bohr's model of the electron is nakedly non-physical yet guides to a probabilistic quantum theory that refuses to admit of fundamental questions of logic and physics by hiding behind a concocted uncertainty principle, now that a physical model has been produced that demolishes the whole probabilistic conception and reduces the current quantum theory to at best a heuristic device undeserving of the respect of physical fundamentality, what does it say of the state of science at the end of the 20th century to keep the finding from the public view?

And if all these findings together demonstrate beyond scientific doubt Design rather than chance as the final arbiter, how do we suppose the coming centuries will judge the honor and scientific integrity of our time, if this most important of all scientific findings that can ever be produced is disavowed by us in silence? How can such childish petulance change the character of objective Truth, or hide our intellectual cowardice to face it squarely?

These are some of the questions that silence as an answer to challenge generates. The Platonists thought that thoughts are objectively existing entities the thinking mind comes across. Perhaps it is in the nature of Truth and Logic that all questions be asked but only those answers kept that together make total sense. If we today kill the messenger for the burdensome yet inescapable message, how do we meet the challenge of History?

Perhaps, I should already have sent you a copy. I did not do so for what I thought I read between the lines of your letter. If I misjudged, again, please forgive me. Now at any rate, you will be able to judge for yourself. There are times when diplomacy and deliberate double meanings be left aside. This is one such time. You will understand why I try to put everything *on* the lines. It is in the nature of things that even our silence is action, and even for that shall we be judged. For just as surely as proof of the Design has been produced, so too has of the Designer and of Judgment.

Sincerely,

Re: LETTER TO PROFESSOR HARRISON

(In reference to his book "*Darkness at Night*")

Prof. E. Harrison
University of Massachusetts,
Amherst, MA 01003

February 11, 1988.

Dear Prof. Harrison:

I read your book "*Darkness at Night*" with interest. I have the following observations:

(1) You seem to have based your solution (p.257) of the riddle on the Stefan-Boltzmann law, by which you calculate a temperature of about 20°K (actually 29. 86°K) after converting the hydrogen atom to energy ($m_H c^2$), which bounces to and fro in 1 m^3 (cross section 1 m^2) 3×10^8 times/sec. One must seriously doubt the propriety of such usage of the S.B. law, because the law expresses the equilibrium black body absorption/emission of energy from a surface of condensed matter. In your "idealized" equivalent there is no condensed matter, no "thermometer"! The applicability of the law to a radiation only universe has never been demonstrated and you do not say that you assume it. The result of your calculation is also in great doubt as will be seen below.

(2) You use the concept of mean free path from the kinetic energy theory of gases. This, too, is highly questionable. In the kinetic theory, the mean free path is defined as $(\text{average velocity}) \times (\text{frequency of collisions})^{-1}$ and the frequency of collisions (assumed perfectly elastic) is taken as the product of $(\text{target area}) \times (\text{concentration of impinging molecules}) \times (\text{average velocity of approach normal to the surface})$, (see Physical Chemistry by E.A. Moelwyn-Hughes, 2nd Edition, Pergamon Press, p. 48 et seq.). Instead, on p. 237 you take the mean free path as $1/n\sigma \equiv V/N\sigma$. In the case of light, the two velocities are both equal to the velocity of light, but the concentration of the impinging molecules must be equated to the concentration of *photons* in the Universe, *not* to stars, as you [chose to] do!

(3) You seem to agree with Kelvin. The equations on pp. 158-9 are questionable. Specifically the second is patently wrong, because it leads to the proposition that if the sky were totally covered with Suns, its brightness would equal the apparent brightness of the Sun's disk. But apparent brightness relates both to

distance and absolute luminosity (assumed the same for all stars). If you moved to Mercury, “the fraction of sky covered by the stars” you would observe at night would still be the same as observed from here, and so would the “brightness of the star-lit sky”. But the *apparent* brightness of the Sun’s disk you would observe, you have to agree, would be greater on account of the reduced distance [to the Sun]. If our sky were totally filled with Suns, it would contain some 184,500 of them. Although half as many at any one instance would be visible, the sky would still be at least 184,500 times brighter than the Sun at high noon: We would be inside a black body and the light (half of the total luminosity) of all 184,500 suns would be trapped inside! If the suns were removed to double the distance, they would have to be four times as many to cover the sky, but the perceived (apparent) total brightness of the entire sky would still be the same as before: In both cases we would be at the center of a black body, the surface of the cavity being the surface of the Sun(s). The size of the cavity is immaterial. In face of this incontrovertible thermodynamic argument, the following calculation must be considered as being beyond reproach:

Observation of galaxies extends to about 1000 Mpc, roughly 3 billion light years. The estimated total mass is 1.15×10^{56} g. For 1.99×10^{33} g/star, there are $N = 5.78 \times 10^{22}$ stars in the sphere of 3 bly, ($v = 4\pi r^3/3$). The assumed uniform number density is $n = N/V$.

A cell of thickness dq at a distance q contains $4n\pi q^2 dq$ stars. Ignoring occultation, their total surface area is $4n\pi^2 a^2 q^2 dq$, representing a fraction of $da = n\pi a^2 dq$ of the surface of the cell (and also of the sky). The total fraction covered by all stars in r (again assuming no occultation) thus is $\alpha = n\pi a^2 r = 3Na^2/4r^2 = 2.61 \times 10^{-11}$ (This very small fraction and galactic diffraction certainly mitigate the problem of occultation which may be ignored in a rough calculation).

At this stage, the *correct* question is: How large a fraction of the *apparent* surface of the Sun does α represent? The answer is 5.41×10^{-6} parts of it! Now, over 3 b.y., all those stars certainly coexist (and we avoid all additional and dubious speculation) and assuming equal luminosities, they together should be producing at night *an equal fraction of sunlight*. The fraction corresponds to a difference of a 13.3 stellar “magnitudes” and since the magnitude of the Sun is -26.8 , they should be producing a total light of magnitude -13.5 or a full magnitude 2.51 times greater than the light of the full Moon!!! Even if you say that our sky is not a black body, light equivalent to 1.25 full moons should be observable at any moment of a moonless clear night. This is what is not observed, and the “riddle” retains its full force! For even if some radiation passes out of the visible into the infrared, so, too, it would be argued, some radiation passes into the visible from the ultraviolet. The “riddle” is seen as such [and intensified] only because we do not take full account of the *entire* energy spectrum, which is the only proper way to think of the problem, but only of the *visible* part of it.

Even so, the total blackness of the seemingly star-free parts of the sky suggests that in those parts there indeed is no star. We [must conclude that we] indeed “see” through to the outside “Stoic” void. For if it were otherwise, and more stars, (apparently fainter) existed at greater distances, they would become visible on the photographic plate through the devices of longer exposure and [films of] greater redshift. But so, instead of seeing galaxies only to the depth of 3 b.l.y. as we do, we should be seeing them, which we do not, to the maximum distance of 10-15 b.l.y., if they existed out to that distance. Through longer exposure, proportionally more distant galaxies should be seen and not only better defined [yet already seen] ones. We cannot with one end of our mouths say that in the early universe stars did not exist, as per current theory, and with the other end that with age more stars (those currently beyond the distance of 10-15 b.l.y.) will become visible. If stars did not exist 10 b.y. ago, they will not become visible in 10 b.y. from now! The universe will then be 20 b.y. old and again no galaxies will be seen as old as the universe! We can never see what never [according to current theory] existed.

The above calculation of the number of stars is free of all dubious speculation about the currently assumed expansion and related problems of spheres of visible and dead stars. Unless we want to create pseudo-scientific myths and then proceed to “solve” them through misapplication of physical laws, if we only go by observation, we cannot in the face of current knowledge argue otherwise than as I just have.

You will now agree that complete “energization” of all condensed matter according to your method should be producing a great deal more brightness than 1.25 full moons! In fact, $(1/2)1.99 \times 10^{33} / 4.23 \times 10^{12}$ times greater. (The factor of 1/2 accounts for the inward pouring radiation. The denominator is the mass depletion of the Sun per second). Even with only half the stars visible (as in a half-cavity) the day-night sky should be 1.17×10^{20} times brighter than 1.25 full moons, $(1/2) \times 5.41 \times 10^{-6} \times 1.17 \times 10^{20} = 3.6 \times 10^{14}$ brighter than the Sun! Obviously, the S. B. law cannot be used as you have used it. The brightness of a body at 20-30°K is negligible and in fact you say that even if 10^{80} hydrogen atoms were energized there should be no more light!!!

The “riddle” of the background darkness is solved convincingly, automatically and most naturally within a much wider, totally natural and elegant new and correct context, as I show in my book “Principia Physica Universi”, which however the scientific establishment prefers for totally unscientific reasons and to our eternal shame as a self-advertised age of free enquiry in the pursuit of knowledge, to keep from the public eye!

Yours sincerely,

COMMENT: The square brackets were used for greater clarity during preparation of the document for the present edition.

42

Re: PROF. HARRISON'S FIRST REPLYUNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS Department of Physics and Astronomy
AT AMHERSTAstronomy Program
517G Lederle Graduate Research Tower B
Amherst, MA 10003

15 February 1988

Dr. George Stavropoulos
3 Renda Place
Green Brook, NJ 08812

Dear Dr. Stavropoulos:

Many thanks for your very interesting letter of February 11. In the calculation you refer to I use the radiation energy density constant, which, as you know, is $4/c$ times the Stefan-Boltzmann constant, and is perhaps more fundamental in derivation than the Stefan-Boltzmann constant.

I must see if I can obtain a copy of your book *Principia Physica Universi*. I enclose one or two reprints that may interest you.

Yours sincerely,

Re: DR. HOHENBERG'S RESPONSE

AT&T

Bell Laboratories

Arno Penzias
Vice President
Research

Room 6A-411
600 Mountain Avenue
Murray Hill NJ 07974
Phone (201) 582-3361

February 23, 1988.

Dear Dr. Stavropoulos:

Dr. Penzias has asked me to read your letter of February 4, 1988 and to look at your book "Principia Physica Universi".

Although I have only had time to read a small part of the book, I have considered your letter carefully and I understand your frustration at the absence of serious critique and refutation of your ideas on the part of the scientific establishment. You must recognize, however, that the motivation to invest time and energy in a critique of your work is small indeed, since you claim to refute concepts and theories of physics which have withstood literally thousands of detailed tests over the years. I am not saying that it is impossible that any of your ideas are correct, only that it is unlikely, since your claims are so extreme. Let me point out, though, that it is not necessary for you to sell the whole package in order to gain notice of the scientific community. If you have uncovered a single *experimentally relevant* inconsistency in the orthodox view of physics, this would be noteworthy. Note that I said "experimentally relevant". I therefore suggest that you pick the most flagrant inconsistency and couch it in terms of a new *experimental prediction*, and write a *short* (less than 5 pages) paper outlining your result, with proper references to previous (presumably incorrect) work. Such a paper if written clearly and concisely would have a better chance of gaining the attention of the physics community. As long as there are no new experiments to do or to interpret the argument remains on a philosophical level and the orthodox views seem to have served satisfactorily, so there is little reason to abandon them.

I hope my thoughts may be helpful to you.

Sincerely yours,

Re: THE REPLY TO DR. HOHENBERG

Dr. P. C. Hohenberg
AT&T Bell Laboratories
600 Mountain Avenue
Murray Hill, NJ 07

February 29, 1988.

Dear Dr. Hohenberg:

Your letter of February 23rd was so utterly disappointing that I am forced to respond. Even the driest "thank you for the book" from Dr. Penzias, or from you on his behalf, would have added a touch of civility. Obviously you too, along with so many others in other high pinnacles of the scientific establishment, have decided that absolute nakedness is preferable. So be it. Proving also that I had not misread the letter of Oct. 28, 1985.

Before dealing with the substance of your letter, I must mention the following: (a) In 399 B.C., five years after they lost for good the Peloponnesian War and had had time to reflect on past glories and follies, the Athenians finally put to death Socrates for his life-long efforts to teach them how to reason, which they had stubbornly refused to learn. His continuing presence among them was an unbearable reminder of conscience. That lesson is still unlearned: In his latest book "The Trial of Socrates", I. F. Stone suggests that Socrates' condemnation was due to his own fault, because a "democratic" majority, or the status quo, is never to blame, and he could have escaped—if he had wanted! (b) In 33 A.D., the Jews, Temple and mob, crucified Christ, for they could not bear the image of their hypocrisy reflected on His Eyes. Again, the majority was not at fault. He could have descended from the Cross as challenged, to save Himself! (c) In the Middle Ages, Bruno was burnt and Galileo barely escaped burning. Again the status quo and the majority were justified! Those guys should never have questioned the reputation of authority! As for their fates, they, too, could have recanted!

Thus having learned nothing from History, and writing on Dr. Penzias', the scientific establishment's and your own behalf, in your letter, you clearly imply that "the absence of serious critique and refutation of (my) ideas on the part of the scientific establishment" and their unwillingness to accept them if unable to refute them are really my fault!: Presumably because I had the temerity to research and produce a bookful of new ideas, when the establishment do not have

“the motivation to invest time and energy” or perhaps even the ability to concentrate, to read more “than 5 pages” at a time! I enclose just such an article that was refused publication because “reviewing it costs money”! If this short and clear article (can you make it shorter, clearer, more concise?) did not cause its recipients, editors and professors to stand on end, what will ever move the establishment?

The irony and hypocrisy of your letter is in your being head of a department of Theoretical Physics Research: You deny me *a priori* the right to ask for attention unless I produce some (impliedly, easily verifiable) “*experimental prediction*”. You know, and you know that I know, that such a rule is *not* universal; for if it were, the vast majority of your fellow-theoreticians would be out of work and would never have published a single word. Still, you attempt to make an argument out of it. Pretending, further, to be a foreign party and not key members of the scientific establishment, and attempting to shirk your own and Dr. Penzias’ responsibility to judge for yourselves the real merits of the case, you also state: “If you have uncovered ...”. What I have uncovered is clearly shown in the book and is fully within the suggested capacity of your titles to evaluate and, if possible, refute. Yet you disingenuously attempt to play bystanders and take refuge behind some “experimentally relevant” finding that I must still write about (as if so many such findings were not already clearly stated in the book, and it were not quite quite enough), when my findings already demonstrate (and as a theoretician you cannot have missed it) that, the very assumptions of rods and clocks on which all experimentation is based *must* now be re-examined.

One such “prediction” (and in reality, absolute logical need, given the irrefutable fact of universal gravitation) is the variability of the velocity of light. Assuming the present estimate of the age of the universe as correct, to produce experimental proof of the variation clear of present-day uncertainties “we” need some 20000 years. Or a 20000-fold increase in our present sensitivity and accuracy. Take your pick. How on Earth will “less than 5 pages” of “experimentally relevant” material from an “unknown” author cause first the (presumably overworked, overfearful of their bosses, and probably inexperienced or incompetent—I already have had opportunity to detect one of each) editors to publish such an article (when high theoreticians such as yourselves *deliberately refuse* to take a position now with all the material in your front, and would certainly reject some such “less than 5 pages” were they ever to come to you for review), and then the experimentalists to be motivated to spend so very much much more time and energy in such an endeavor (when presumably pure theoreticians such as yourself do not get motivated by a bookful of arguments to wonder and decide whether or not there is finally upon us a logical need to begin looking *maturely* at the world and no longer as boys at toys—big boys call them “scientific

experiments”), you really have not explained!!! And this irony and hypocrisy *cannot* have escaped you.

Since when have theoreticians decided so to limit themselves by “experimental predictions” when experiment falls so far short of need? Since when does logical analysis of the facts require some additional and unspecified “experimental prediction”, when what we already have more than suffices to prove the point? In your front you have the argument that *there is out there a natural law*, if there ever was one, the law of gravitation, which even after 300 years we still have not understood: either with respect to r (which can only be specified exactly if there is an *additional natural law* that determines the exact path of gravitation), or with respect to G as a dimensional, *natural* quantity (which requires the exclusive kind of analysis that I have produced)! Dr. Penzias, a Nobel laureate, and you as head of a department of Theoretical Physics Research find these basics unimportant?

For a full 100 years we have been doing sophisticated experiments (certainly included in your “thousands of detailed tests”), yet *neither* experimentalists nor theoreticians have understood that the conventional analysis of the M-M experiment *is basically flawed!!!* You now have the correct analysis in your front and what do you do? Dr. Penzias asks you to find a way to extricate him and you think that you do so by suggesting that I write short articles and resubmit them to incompetent underlings, while the “gods” up on high play the Sphinx pretending ignorance of the facts!!!

Also enclosed herewith is a copy of the paper submitted to the Physical Review and mentioned in my letter of Feb.4. You will notice their own markings. The first of the three copies had been considerably used and unstapled (which means that it was studied and found worth copying), before all three copies were returned to me at my request, after they decided on alleged “editorial grounds” (“no longer publishing papers on relativity” was the unbelievable telephonic excuse) to reject it, thus avoiding any statement on the content. Kindly please study it (as a theoretician you will have no difficulty) side-by-side with the 1905 paper, and you will find what was then perpetrated on Logic and Science. If you find my analysis faulty, please show. If not, please act as indicated below.

Since 1913, because it so wanted, the scientific establishment swallowed blatantly *non*-physical theories of the hydrogen atom, developed additional theories of “probability clouds” and indeterminacy (thus protecting them and itself, or so they thought, from all future criticism!) and gave them the aura of hard objective fact (in B. Russell’s sense). It also claimed that no law “simple or otherwise” explains the spectra of the other atoms. Now, a single, simple, *physical* law is produced for the spectra of all atoms. You have it in your front as have had all previous reviewers. Yet under the lamentable excuse of “having had time

to read only a small part of the book”, you, as they, pass up the finding in silence and again suggest that I write “experimentally relevant” papers! May an honorable man of science ask for more than the analysis of the spectra contained in the book???

Now, to the even harder part of this letter: Because it *cannot* have escaped you that if “(my) claims are so extreme” yet prove right, the extremity and grotesqueness properly belong to the currently held theories (that “work” as the theory of epicycles also “worked” yet was patently wrong, but still simplicity itself when compared to the grotesqueness of the current theories, if found wrong as they now are), because your *deliberate* failure to refute or approve rather seems designed to protect the current theories from public debate and exposure and the scientific establishment from the extreme embarrassment of being openly shown to have wallowed in such grotesqueness for so long, because your suggestion seems well designed to keep the “trial proceedings” from ever opening, because all (scientific and far beyond) that really is at stake has not escaped you for a moment (and even less so with the additional material enclosed), I cannot regard Dr. Penzias’ response of 1985 or his non-response/your response now as anything more than a perfectly transparent attempt most disingenuously to shirk off responsibility of competent refutation of approval, to protect the status quo, cruelly deliberately and in full disregard of another’s (mine) efforts and indeed sacrifices to send him (me) off to a knowingly foredoomed expedition after a red herring, and (if I am so stupidly naive as to cower to the suggestion from on high) to delay indefinitely the disclosure of the truth my book contains. You claim to “have considered my letter carefully”! How on Earth can a theoretician such as yourself write so, thus demonstrating he has understood nothing? Did you think that I wrote to Dr. Penzias (in 1985 and again now) before I found (on both occasions) the “established procedure” miserably wanting?

I did not write to him in his capacity at AT&T but on his Nobel prize. Those engaged in Science are still supposed to seek the Truth regardless of employer or consequences. If my attempt to find the Truth has failed, you both have deliberately neglected stating it, despite your clear obligation to say so and why. I cannot let you off the hook so easily. The obligation either to disprove or to accept is inseparable from doing Science and we all Nobelists and lowly servants are subject to it. Excuses are *not* worth the (in your case, *corporate*) paper they are written on.

So the ball is still in your corner. You must either disprove my findings or strongly recommend and insist that (a) the enclosed papers be sent for immediate publication, having already been pre-reviewed, and (b) an *objective and competent review* of my book be undertaken and published in the shortest possible period of time. When the validity and value of every experiment are at stake because the assumptions are no longer to be trusted, my argument is *not* too

“philosophical” to merit attention. As a theoretician you surely know the difference between orthodox and conventional. Yet you *confuse* them. Abuse of these concepts by members of the establishment can only be an overbearing attempt to enforce established dogma as orthodoxy and thus shield it from thus [being] seen as [coming under] anti-establishmentarian criticism. Neither Einstein nor Dirac, late in life, had any illusions about the transitory nature of both current theories. Preserving discredited theories is not respecting their authors. True homage is that we keep on trying to understand the world in which we live, *all* of it, even if it means replacing theories. Death teaches humility. Unless what we find is pegged upon the truly immortal, and not on what established convention *in deliberate ignorance* of the larger “philosophical” questions accepts as such, we have found and learned absolutely nothing. It is astounding that as a theoretician you chose to close your letter by sidestepping what you call “philosophical level”, which however *is* the basic level of all Science!

It cannot possibly have escaped you that this century of heretofore *unequaled and continuing* barbarity of man against Man and Nature, is also the century of unequaled scientific advance crowned and led by relativity and indeterminacy, introduced early in the century, that are, after all is said and done, the abolition of every worthy absolute and a license for *added* barbarity. If you say that the two are disconnected and tragically coincidental, you really are much too soft on yourselves and only trying to invent excuses. What has happened and still happens is the profound effect of these beliefs. This century can only redeem itself, if it can salvage, from the vast ruins of the human spirit it has produced as no other age before it, those specks of immortal truth found during it. Unless we, late in the century and the millennium, remove all falsehood from our bequest to the future, we really have sealed our ignominious name. I do not know how you top research people at Bell Labs see yourselves. The picture your letter reveals is not good and the future will not forgive the glibness, inanity and naked insincerity of your letter in response to this challenge. The ball is still in your quarter.

As for “gaining notice”, you know it comes with the territory and there is nothing one can do about it. The honor belongs to the ideas. The honor of authorship is incidental, not primary and only due because one has had the courage to stand up and state the new ideas. PROVE ME WRONG AND I DESERVE NOTHING. But if you cannot, yet you deny my findings through deliberate silence (and your letter IS silence!) their proper place, I fail to see how you can possibly avoid the charge of added barbarism against the human spirit that you will thus perpetrate even as this bitter century closes.

So you see, AS YOU ALREADY KNOW, that much much more is at stake, and I earnestly hope you will see the bluntness as only proportional to the severity of the problem. I put everything on the line to avoid misunderstanding,

and to let you see how far your work still is from being done, because our century has been and still is so grotesque. The picture of calculated nakedness your letter reveals cannot oblige the recipient to avert his eyes and hold his pen. Our common humanity obliges this recipient to beg you to reconsider.

Gentlemen, you are still honor bound: Do as honor dictates and I shall not let other eyes see this letter.

Most sincerely,

THIS AUTHOR'S PRESENT COMMENT: To date, more than twenty two and a half years have passed since the above letter was sent out. No answer was ever received and no action taken as requested. I never met Doctors Penzias and Hohenberg personally, and I do not even know whether they are still alive, or have departed. I am already passed my complete seventy-five years of age, and I know not when I too shall depart. Before I do, I take it to be *my duty to bequeath freely* this knowledge to the coming generations. *Not* to dishonor the two Gentlemen who did not act as honor dictated, which was a condition for me to keep other eyes off this material, but in order to show that even Nobel laureates are *not* above pettiness! The cruelty of the twentieth century *was definitely enhanced* by the contributions of scientists that provided the pseudophilosophical and seemingly scientific justification that made it possible. In order that that cruelty stop, the "science" that goes on behind closed doors and its details are kept from the general public *must* be exposed! After so long a past time since then, I can no longer keep this material secret.

The article the Physical Review refused to publish mentioned in my letter of February 4, 1988 and referred to in my letter of February 28, 1988 is already included in this book. The Reader can draw his own conclusions. The other paper (in all probability the one titled "Unification of the binary solutions laws"), that was found with my papers and copies of the letters on physics sent to various recipients at the time, having to do with chemistry and metallurgy, in the interests of saving space, may be omitted from this collection.

Re: LETTER TO IMPERIAL COLLEGE

Prof. Eric A. Ash, Rector
IMPERIAL COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
London SW7 2AZ
England.

March 26, 1988.

Dear Rector:

Although I shall make every effort to attend the alumni reception in your honor at New York, I cannot at present be certain of being able to do so. Under separate cover, I am sending you a copy of my book *PRINCIPIA PHYSICA UNIVERSI*, that I was forced to self-publish in 1986. Since it is not certain that my book will arrive or that you will have the time even to peruse it before your departure, I am sending you this letter to explain its contents. So at least we shall have something tangible to talk about at the reception.

In the book, I have had the courage to ask some ultimate questions and seek reasonable, mutually compatible and supportive answers. The leading question was a natural extension of an engineer's approach to things: If lesser bodies, at least those subject to human will and manipulation, are engineered, i.e. meticulously designed and brought into existence, so perhaps too, and to a degree of *absolute* perfection, is the entire world. If so, the *fact* of engineering should become evident from the Natural Laws themselves, if completely freed of distorting human supposition. It should then be a relatively easier matter to show whether the engineering took place from within the Universe, in which case the Universe would be shown to be self-engineered, or from without, in which case we should have scientific proof of its Creator! As you well know, the question of the Creator, scientists in general and pure theoreticians in particular have chosen to avoid, and when presented with it, they attempt to evade, generally very tortuously. But the question asked in the fashion just described is so compelling logically that one cannot evade it honorably with a straight face. That I did ask the question is in very large part due to my education at the I.C., where I was taught never to be afraid to ask questions, the more difficult ones the better, the mother's milk of research.

It was almost guaranteed from the beginning that, the answers would be just as revolutionary as the questions themselves: If engineered, the world

should be able to give a full and consistent account of itself and provide reasonable answers to all basic questions regarding it, without the intercession of impertinent human supposition hiding behind arbitrary so-called “principles”. This indeed ultimately was found to be the case:

My logical and scientific analysis shows that starting from Newton’s Law of Gravitation, for 300 years, theoreticians have managed to miss its full import. That the Law as incontrovertible Natural Law is incomplete in itself without full specification of *all* natural quantities entering it has not so far been understood. Thus (a): That an *additional* Natural Law *is required* specifying the path and thus the *exact* length of separation has *not* been appreciated. Without such a Law, deciding whether Newton’s Law is obeyed in the strictest sense is meaningless. The straight, Euclidian line separation *is a human supposition* that in no way obliges Nature. (b): That the universal dimensional “proportionality” constant G is anything but a curious or “trivial” factor also so far has sorely been missed. How it is possible for a Natural, universal and fundamental Law to contain anything less than absolutely fundamental is something that the theoreticians have never explained. This was the beginning.

The detailed analysis shows that the Universe permits only that G [shown necessarily to be equal to $(6\pi DT^2)^{-1}$, where D the average density of matter in and T the age of the Universe] and M [the *total* amount of matter in the Universe] be constant. And these require that the Universe expand with decreasing velocity, no other than the velocity of light, proportional to the $-1/3$ -power of the universal age. Also that, ipso facto, length ceases to be a basic physical dimension, as lengths are now specified in terms of $(GMT^2)^{1/3}$; and that the energy is *not* conserved are direct and inescapable consequences. Basic principles of modern science are thus refuted by a proper analysis of the facts of Nature. Whether we like it or not, this is incontestable.

This led into examining the logical and physical foundations of relativity theory. These too were found sorely wanting. On the logical side, it is basically incompatible with an elegantly conceived structure that anything related to it could possibly be left dangling “relatively”. The existence of absolute universal time controlling all processes including, fundamentally, the velocity of light, is fitting the conception of an absolutely meticulously designed dynamic structure, but is the doom of relativity. On the physical side, the one experiment, the Michelson-Morley experiment, that has been alleged to support sp. relativity is, on re-examination, found to have been sorely misinterpreted. The correct analysis shows that that experiment does *not* support the theory of relativity, for its outcome agrees with current interpretation *only if the total velocity vector is exactly aligned with the principal interferometer axis*. The numerous interferometric tests have guaranteed precisely that *no special direction be given undue favor*. Thus the experiment kills the relativistic interpretation and forcefully introduces

a locally and temporally (on a moment by moment basis) preferred orientation: That of the *total velocity vector*, an inescapable component of which is the locally applicable universal expansion velocity vector.

As for the other experimental findings, so far uniquely attributed to relativity, those too have been deduced by means independent of relativity, special or general. The famous mass-velocity relationship follows naturally from the consideration of the nature of light: Since light is gravitationally retarded and since light is the fundamental component of all bodies on account of which alone can the Michelson Morley experiment be fully understood, no energy is massless: Even the fundamental photon, the *true* atom, *has* mass. When bodies are put to motion, they are given impulses resulting from the addition of energy and thus of real mass to them. The “relativistic” mass-velocity relationship follows from these considerations and is itself an approximation when the effects of the universal expansion are ignored. The only finding that I have not yet been able to account for is the exact calculation of the precession of Mercury. Reason of the failure is the very substantial uncertainty in the exact size of the semi-axes, which masks and makes impossible to calculate the amount of precession per revolution. Perhaps there may be a way to calculate the effect over many revolutions, but I have not yet examined this possibility.

The above findings, even with the last reservation, are so fundamental that one perhaps would be satisfied with them alone. I was not. Because they call into direct question the validity of the assumptions underlying quantum theory, starting from Bohr’s conception of the electron in the atom. Because the Universe loses energy as it expands, our attributing more energy to the electron as it is put into greater orbit is in fundamental conflict. Other logical defects of the current theory are also brought to bear. My researches led to a totally new model of the electron. The model is fully physical, not probabilistic. The electron is a vibrating spherical hollow shell. Consecutive electrons in a single atom are arranged as consecutive concentric hollow spheres, vibrating in tune with each other. An exact picture of the goings-on is obtained and the uncertainty principle is killed as such and reborn as the principle of least action, the value of h being dependent on the age of the Universe. The spectra of all atoms are being interpreted by a *single modified and expandable Rydberg-type law*.

Dear Rector, you will recognize that these are not findings that can be passed up in silence. They deserve immediate detailed attention and, if irrefutable, acceptance. They are the stuff major scientific revolutions are made of. My attempts to obtain competent refutation OR comment by major scientific personalities in the USA, including eight Nobel laureates, have remained unanswered. My challenge that they (and we all) behave as honorable men of science seeking the truth for its own sake regardless of consequences has remained unmet. It is most painful to find that major scientific personalities will pass up in silence a

call upon their own honor to refute or approve of findings of this obvious importance. Perhaps the state of science in the USA is such that it no longer permits individual scientists in high places the luxury to have or express responsibly their own opinion, or to jeopardize “projects” the continued support of which depends on the current assumptions not being so fundamentally questioned. Perhaps, too, their silence is due to my attempting to do the honorable thing: Answer the original question as regards the Creator. The analysis of the scientific facts that I have produced is positive. This to many must be very troubling and “deserving” to be kept well covered up. I trust, under your rectorship, the I.C. has maintained jealously its total intellectual independence and dignity and will not shirk in the face of whatever findings, if irrefutable.

Each one of us sees one’s obligations as a person, scientist or engineer differently. I have seen my degrees from Sheffield and London as particularly heavy responsibilities and would not do anything to risk bringing dishonor to the institutions from which I graduated. The inability of anyone I have so far contacted to contest the core of my challenge gives me confidence that I am on the right track and that the silence of the scientific establishment, refusing to review my work, refusing to give reasons why they refuse to review it, and preventing my book from being put in university and major public libraries even when given as a gift, relates only to the politics of science and of public “philosophy”.

I thus am addressing you to elicit from my own most beloved I.C. either competent refutation or full public support. Even if I am only partly correct, the honor that is bound to flow back to the I.C. from having taught a student that in time courageously produced such findings in the face of a largely inimical world, cannot be overestimated. Perhaps, too, you will find it only proper in the best British tradition to come to the side of a beleaguered colleague fighting alone the good fight, even if the consequences of his success are bound to be jarring to established beliefs. I find it incomprehensible that my effort and struggle can possibly fail to produce deep interest and concern at the I.C., or that a decision will be made, as it obviously has in this country, that the truth be kept from the public eye and the truth-seeker cruelly be punished for embarrassing the establishment.

I will not hide from you the fact that this “extracurricular” effort of mine since 1974 when I first started has cost me tending to furthering my career as a research metallurgist. Moreover, my diligent attention to matters of metallurgy brought upon me the wrath of people preferring the expedient rather than the proper and has caused me to become unemployed and unable to find work for the last 40 months. I am regarded as overeducated, overqualified, beyond the daily pursuits, too concerned about the future of metallurgy that is not the concern of those whose horizon is limited to the current quarter’s report, too “academic” and too “controversial” to be offered a position even in a university,

where pursuits are dictated by fashion rather than either by scientific necessity or social need.

So I need your support not only for the good reasons that I described above but also in order that I straighten out and vindicate my career that will have not been in vain, even as I sought to find much needed answers regarding science and the entire reality, where they were sorely needed at the foundations of science and Logic, far and away beyond the ordinary call of duty of an engineer.

My work remains unknown because of the obstructionism of the establishment and because I lack the means to make it known on my own, except perhaps finally my means of this communication. If you find you can and should get behind my effort, I am willing to consider whatever arrangements are needed to make the I.C. the sole distributor of the first edition (there are roughly 1000 copies in my hands) and publisher-distributor of subsequent editions.

Your thoughts and proposals will be appreciated most deeply.

Most sincerely yours,

46

Re: LETTER TO WIFE

(Exact translation of the Greek original)

Athens, Greece

May 20, 1988

Marina my Dearest:

I want *you and the rest of the Family* to read these pages, and then that you make a copy of them, and then that you personally deliver this hand-written prototype to Bishop of Adrousa Mr. Anast. Giannoulatos, so that in the presence of eye witnesses, despite the distance, stand every word. I shall refer briefly to certain substantial matters.

(1) Since the days of Socrates, the problem of juxtaposition between the *seeming* and the *ideal-true form* of “things” has been clearly set. *Seeming* as superficially seems or is “explained” by man-made theories of myopic consideration. *Ideal-true* as the things have been constructed and stand in their fullest perfection. It is counterfeiting of the Socratic-Platonic spirit to limit the juxtaposition to the purely theoretical or philological level. The matter is a matter of TRUE SUBSTANCE of the objective things and as a consequence a matter of scientific, mathematical, and fully Logical and thus *complete analysis to no limit at all*. Neither the “philosopher”, nor the philologist, nor the purely “theoretical” scientist have a right to demand exclusivity of the field for themselves. The question of how the objective world functions, moreover, is not only a matter for the exclusivity of the experimental scientist, examining the world on the basis of theories constructed by theoreticians. It constitutes also and mainly a matter for the engineering scientist, who feels and *must* regard himself obligated *to examine and to the extent possible compose, at least in thought*, the objective world according to *full* Logical analysis from the very first principles, then *to proceed to the construction* of the very first materials, *to mix* these such as *to construct the full, variegated and perfect sum-total of all existing species* (inorganic, organic, biological), then *to set them all to functioning* and then *to keep them all in functioning!* In juxtaposition to this *complete duty* of the engineering scientist, every other baseless theoretical statement becomes unquestionably laughable in its complete superficiality. As an example, I mention the matter of the presently accepted (but now already proven false) principle of the constancy of the velocity of light. Even though this principle constitutes the basis of the theory of relativity and the entire present-day “science”, the question of HOW light (an ob-

ject) keeps the *constancy* of its velocity (*another* object) in *every* point of the world (a yet other many-object) and in every time conceivable (a yet other many-object) has NOT been examined! The general and special requirements of construction of the world and of light AND their functioning in time such as to keep always constant the velocity of light have NOT been examined in detail, if at all! The seemingly weighty and arrogant self-proclaimed “specialists” choose to remain blind in the face of this need to understand all these HOWS, while the humble engineer agonizes to find the answer: For everything that objectively exists there is a full answer, to every pertinent question. Nobody is licensed to ignore the Truth of the validity these questions and statements, or to pretend that they are without colossal significance.

(2) The question of whether or not the world has been constructed does NOT constitute a question of *theoretical* positioning on this matter, as ostensibly being a question of faith, as *falsely* up to now has been taken. The idea that this is a matter of pure faith, affirmative for the believers in God, and negative for the unbelievers IS FUNDAMENTALLY FALSE. The question correctly posited is (i) a matter of the objective evidence of the objective world regarding its own construction; and (ii) if the world is constructed, whether its construction is the result of its own means set to work exclusively on their own, that is to say whether the world has been self-constructed and functions *as it is being observed*, or whether the world is incapable of being self-constructed, in which case and given its self-evident construction according to (i), this construction has unavoidably been effected by a FOREIGN to its own nature Agent, namely by God.

(3) Construction, by definition requires design, *complete* specifications, a law of construction (*all tuned* to obtain the PURPOSE of construction!) A spurious mixing of ideas and things constitutes disorder, ugliness, a chaotic state of affairs, in other words, a complete state of indescribable mess. The κοσμιότης of the Κόσμος witnesses its *perfect* construction.

(4) Normal functioning requires, in addition, *all* the full laws and specifications needed for regular operation.

(5) The matter of searching for the objective witness of construction according to (2) requires the rejection during this search of every human principle, theory, or predisposition and the re-examination, all the way from the foundation on up, of the OBJECTIVE NATURAL LAWS, that is to say the Laws of Nature, *not* those of “physics”, that has substituted its own “laws” (namely, human ideas) in the place of the Laws.

(6) The matter of perfection of construction demands absolute frugality of Laws, principles and means. This minimum sum contains elements supplementing each other, *never* in conflict with each other, and *never* in any way of excess. Only such perfection deserves a perfect Creator, and He of only such perfection is, on account of His own self-respect, capable. In other words, the Lord God

does *not* end up doing imperfect works, or miscarriages of form and function. Every secondary natural law by need refers to the above least set of primary laws. Given the perfection, NOTHING is spurious, imperfectly defined or chancy.

(7) Any conception about God-Creator-Creation rejecting the above positions as the very least (that is, if the above positions require additions aiming at their ever stricter application), or rejecting these positions as immaterial and “unimportant” *is* itself unimportant.

(8) For the first time in the history of civilization and of science, these matters are set on the table before us for the strictest and most austere possible examination. The book (i.e., the PRINCIPIA PHYSICA UNIVERSI) demonstrates that the above positions do have an *objective* basis. The principles of so-called “physics” and its laws *are* incomplete or false. E.g., (i) given the gravitation (unquestionable physical object), the principle of the constancy of the velocity of light *is* fundamentally false; (ii) the *correct* analysis of the Michelson-Morley experiment *prohibits* its up to now *accepted as correct yet false*, interpretation that seems to justify Einstein’s theory of relativity (special, as a first step to constructing the general); (iii) The law of gravitation demands the existence of a *common and universal measure of time, that is none other than the age of the universe*. Einstein rejects this. In the face of the objective law of gravitation and this man-made theory (purposely ignoring the total objectivity, frugality, perfection of Laws, and the mechanism of operation of the universe), the human theory is proven objectively false and it must be rejected in toto. Time is one and continuous and it too was created at the moment of Creation.

(9) The now standard view regarding electrons and atoms, due mainly to Bohr (and the so-called Copenhagen School), refers to his unnatural, i.e., unreal and non-physical conception of the electron. In the face of the impossibility of finding a physical explanation incorporating Bohr’s original understanding, the present quantum theory was gradually invented (having incorporated the principle of indeterminacy as a *supposedly fundamental law of imperfection* of the natural world, that denies the existence of a singular and fully defined law of construction of the atom. The conception (model) of the electron that is presented in the book, proves how completely false the accepted views are. The examination of the principle of least action (that has *erroneously and falsely* been taken by Bohr and all the rest of that school as the principle of indeterminacy) *proves absolutely that nothing* has been left unpinned, or is exempt of the consequences (if they be Logically necessary) of the age of the Universe as the absolute measure of universal time. The observed indeterminacy is a *secondary consequence and limitation* of “experimentation”. Fundamentally, EVERYTHING, even in the least physically possible scale, *is* fully and absolutely determined.

(10) The detailed examination of the revealed Laws proves the ABSOLUTE INABILITY of the natural world to have established and to be subjected

on its own to these Laws. The Laws are *in addition* to matter. NOT from it. The Lawgiver and Creator *was present before the world*, by the sheer force of LOGICAL NEED.

(11) It is necessary that *every seriously proposed* new scientific position be either rejected following the proof of its invalidity, or that it be accepted as conditionally true until it itself is shown to be invalid. Proof of invalidity of an accepted position must be accepted at once, unless said proof is shown to be false.

(12) the entire scientific world, (theologians, philosophers, physicists, others) keep *dishonorably* silent on the matters raised by the book. Titles, honors, positions held have not so far moved them to utter a meaningful public word for or against. Their silence is *not*, therefore, of an honorable disposition before a matter the importance of which is unquestionably second to none. If it were, as a measure of the most elemental good will and proper social behavior, they ought to have sent note of the matter being under the deserving serious consideration. Since the findings compose the scientific proof of the sought after proof of the existence of God (*proportionally that much far greater* than the proof of the existence of the creator of La Gioconda given the existence of that piece of art!), for the theologians, they constitute matters of their most immediate attention and study *as a matter of absolute priority* and sufficient justification for them to demand from the “specialists” to take a *proven* position. In the history of civilization, no matter was ever, or shall ever again be more serious than the matter of the scientific proof of the existence of God. As a result, any occasion of presumed “justification” to avoid bringing the matter to the most public attention is absolutely forbidden for the so-called “theologians”. The language and the time limits for receiving a meaningful and well justified reply must be sharper than the so far sharpest knife. Every other position cannot but have a self-proven evil intent. A Bishop of the Church who attempts to justify his refusal to write and demand from the “specialists” a word exactly as just put forward, hiding himself behind such statements as “I know them, they will not write because they are so very busy” accepts as “logical” the justification of “I just bought a new field“, and is a result unworthy of position, title and honors, as also of the Christian name, since he accepts as logical the justification of the Devil! Of course we may not extract from anyone by force an affirmative confession of the Truth, which he does not offer on his own free accord. Confession under pressure is without value. The problem is not there, but on whether it is permitted for a Christian to regard the silence of the atheists standing before a matter of such importance sufficient as so justified, or whether we can and are justified to regard as our duty to extract from them a *mute* confession of the Truth, given their *obviously evil purposeful silence*! My proposition that both bishops write as I have suggested to them since 1987 was meant in the spirit of insuring for them and the Church, in view of their clear obligation toward the Holy Spirit, in case

the so-called “experts” keep silent or fail to prove my findings as baseless. If the Bishop Mr. Anast. Giannoulatos accepts the material that I have brought (book, other arguments, correspondence with the “experts”) as sufficient, he is not obligated to demand anything more from them. In such a case he honors me beyond any expectation. But also, in such a case, his so far inactivity to declare my findings thus sufficiently revealing remains beyond explanation. If he ceases to remain inactive, all is well. I shall accept the loss of time so far as necessary for the comprehension and digestion in his conscience of the colossal significance of the matter. But if neither to the experts he decides to write *and* he remains inactive as regards the matters suggested by the Holy Spirit, he will have proven his own ill will and indifference in the face of the Divine Will. His suggested referring the matter to the professors in Athens shall be meaningful and concrete only if they too are set under the very same terms and limitations. Otherwise it is only a *subterfuge and naked effort* to gain time and eventually do nothing. When the opportunity is offered to him to write to the very top of the world “experts” and he chooses to approach local pals, scared second-rate underlings, his intentions *cannot* be all that courageous and decisive! That much is quite clear!

(13) Where we have reached is now clear. Absolutely nothing so far has proven more destructive of the moral foundation of Man than the principles of relativity and indeterminacy. Today, even the security of the world and everything else depend on the sayings of soothsayers and the horoscope of our “leaders”! For this precipitous descent, the absolute and exclusive responsibility lies on the people of the intellect and Spirit, and mainly on the bishops of the Church who have abandoned up to that very point their properly meant episcopal duties. For *their* misbehavior have the people turned to atheism, and here indeed before us all are the results! *No* Church, and *that much less* the Orthodox, is justified to hide behind the Holy Blood and the blood of the Saints in justification of their inaction during this present day. The confession of misbehavior both during the past and in the present must be contrite and thunderously public. Otherwise the bishops waste their time over nothing and attempt to escape from their clearest duty. So much more *must* the Church take the lead, as the blasphemy keeps on growing! That *is* clear. Has the Church the right to sit by doing essentially nothing? How indeed may the Lord judge the world, when the consciences have so much fallen into the darkness as to find themselves unable to judge objectively both good and evil? In order that the blasphemy come to its end, it is necessary that the End come! But for the End (the Judgment) to come, it is necessary that the person judged be able to stand both the Judgment and its consequences! [For this reason the mentally sick are not brought to judgment!] When the consciences are so deep in darkness, they *must* first be enlightened, namely, become able to comprehend the scientifically proven Being of God and His Will. The scientific proof of these *is* therefore INDISPENSABLE on the Way to the End, because

today the world only scientific proofs believes or accepts to believe. The book provides the scientific proof. A bishop remaining inactive before all these is either incompetent, or a traitor worse than Judas Iscariot! Other ground for one to stand upon *does not* exist! Anyone who travelled to Africa and saw the hunger and the general death of peoples by starvation, is UNWORTHY and derelict when the means to expose the unconscionable waste of a trillion dollars per year spent on armaments is at hand but is not used to turn those expenditures to bread to feed the hungry, in order not to harm the interests of the warmongers. What worse do the Churches await in order to stop being inactive in the face of this juxtaposition? So many lives, so many souls are lost! Are they not quite enough for the very busy “Bishops”??? When at last shall they comprehend that in the last struggle of Light against the darkness THERE ARE NO SPECTATORS, and all inactivity of Bishops and activity of professors and scientists, is mainly on the side of the Darkness???

In no way do I oppose the collaboration of the Bishops of Adrousa and Florina, or any other person of the intellect and the Spirit. If to some committee is the consideration of the matter sent, to it too must also be sent *in their entirety* the contents of my letters of July 7, and October 30, to both Bishops, as well as the present letter. For this reason do I also enclose herewith copies of my correspondence with Dr. Arno Penzias (Nobel prize) and Dr. Hohenberg writing on the former’s behalf. I consider their silence since February as having untied my hand.

All these in order that it not be thought that they accomplish anything when they present to you my Dear Wife false “arguments”. They do not have to deal with you, but with what the Lord God gave *me*. I am proud for what you have managed to do so far, and in the manner in which you spoke to them, for the Love of Christ.

Kissing you dearly

P.S.: I also enclose three sheets of errata. Give one to each you gave the book, and use the third to make more copies for future use.

AUTHOR’S COMMENT: Despite my efforts and blunt language to obtain *written responses and action* from both Bishops, I totally failed! They did *not* have either the manly courage nor that given by the weight of the Churches under them to express a *valid* theological opinion on the fundamental question of proof of the existence of God! The people *must* thus wonder as to the theological expertise even of the seemingly best of Bishops! No wonder we are where we are spiritually!!!

Re: THE RECTOR'S REPLY

IMPERIAL COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

London SW7 2AZ

From the Rector:

Professor **E A Ash** CBE FEng FRS

May 31, 1988

Dear Dr. Stavropoulos,

I have now had a chance to read some of your fascinating book *Principia Physica Universi*. Its style is always thought provoking and challenging. I am sure you must have enjoyed writing it – that comes through every page!

I have to add, in all honesty, that for those bits of it where I have some personal knowledge I found myself in profound disagreement with your perceptions. But then, I am only an Electronic Engineer....

In any event, I would like to convey my renewed thanks for your kindness in sending me a copy.

With best wishes,
Yours sincerely

AUTHOR'S COMMENT: It is painful to see the “profound disagreement with your perceptions” totally unspecified, in full view of the specifics in both my letter and the book, especially following the Rector's first paragraph! One *must* wonder: What indeed do the points of omission at the end of the second paragraph *truly* stand for?

— Do they stand for the Rector's disagreement as that of a professor having devoted his academic life solely to matters electronic *without any* regard to the wider issues that Science *must* face in studying Physical Reality that *cannot but be wholesome in itself, or else there can be no Science*, thus allowing that his “profound disagreement” may not be as weighty as it must seem to a layman

reading the Rector's reply to me, despite the *total absence* of some specific point suggesting error in my analysis of the hard physical facts?

— Do they stand for the Rector's suggestion that I, too, should have done the same, limiting myself to the narrow matters of my field? If so, to whom do we arrogate the responsibility of studying Physical Reality? Aren't we all honor-bound to study it to the very limits of our capability? *What* is the unique field of studying Physical Reality? Physics? If so, how is it that for more than three hundred years *all* bona fide physicists have failed to produce a dimensional analysis of Newton's law of gravitation and to proceed diligently from there, much as I have done?

— Do we arrogate that responsibility to Einstein? If so, we must take due note of his statement in §4 of his 1916 paper on the "Foundations of the General Theory of Relativity" in which he stated that "It is not my purpose ... to represent the general theory of relativity as a system that is as simple and logical as possible and with the minimum number of axioms; but my main object is to develop this theory in such a way that the reader will feel that the path we have entered upon is *psychologically* [stress added] the natural one, and that the underlying assumptions will seem to have the highest possible degree of security". If this be a legitimate foundation on which to study the hard Physical Reality, Einstein asks us to give greater weight to *psychology* than to austere simple and sound Logic examining even the "logic" of axioms! Can it be that Einstein gave greater faith to Freudianism than to the physics of hard facts [in B. Russell's sense] which he *thus* chose to study *psychologically*, yet under the *thus false* name of physical science? I must ask: is psychology, *seeming* to offer the highest possible degree of (*what?*) security to underlying assumptions, to be preferred over the hardest possible degree of Logic, which Einstein *thus consciously chose* to set aside?

To decide this issue, kindly consider the case of a clinic for the mentally disturbed, in which one inmate thinks of himself as being Napoleon, another as being von Bismarck, and a third as being Alexander the Great. And compare that situation to Einsteinism according to which *each one* of us (*and every animal, and every stone and every molecule*) is fully "psychologically" justified to regard him(it)self as being *at the very center of the same one entire* Universe! Here, the mental disturbance of three unfortunate persons is to be compared to the grandest lunacy envisioned for the entire austere Universe that is [in the name of modern so-called "physics"] reduced to General Madhouse!!! Never for a moment have either Einstein or his followers considered the issue of mythical Atlas carrying on his shoulders the Earth and the entire World, while himself standing on nowhere at all!!! Nor have they asked themselves how we all manage to carry with us, with our feeble muscle power, the *very same entire* Universe centered upon each one of us as *we all* move about in *all* directions!!!

So the Rector and I are indeed in profound disagreement, but now even the layman, having a minimal faith in his own senses, can discern where the truth lies. General Relativity *is* the polite name (as befits "sophisticated" society) given to *that* house, above called General Madhouse!!!

Re: LETTER TO PROF. S. W. HAWKING

Prof. Stephen W. Hawking
Dept. of Mathematics & Theoretical Physics
University of Cambridge
Cambridge, England

June 24, 1988.

Dear Professor Hawking:

I am addressing you and sending the enclosed copy of my book *PRINCIP-
IA PHYSICA UNIVERSI* on account of your position in modern science. If the
contents of my book are correct, the present attempts, based on relativity and the
current quantum mechanics, to unravel the mysteries of the creation of the uni-
verse are doomed to failure. If those contents are not correct, someone with your
abilities should be able to demonstrate them to be so without much difficulty.

I was forced to self-publish because I could get neither refutation nor en-
dorsement while the book was still in manuscript. Since publication, although I
have strenuously sought again refutation and competent reviews from a large
number of prominent scientists, journals and organizations, these have been de-
nied either through silence or transparently disingenuous evasions. Also denied
have been the reasons for this treatment, which has also included denial by li-
braries to accept the book and put it on the shelves even when offered as a gift!

There has been ample evidence to show that you have been a man of ex-
emplary intellectual independence and courage. Perhaps, then, you will bring
these qualities to bear upon the important question of whether failure so far to
obtain a more general and fundamental understanding of the issues of the cre-
ation of the universe is due to the intrinsic difficulty of the problem, or to the
fact that it is being approached from an angle that is intrinsically unable to yield
such understanding. In the latter case, you for one would not want to waste an-
other moment chasing after the impossible.

The full and far-reaching implications of Newton's Law of Gravitation
have neither been analyzed before nor yet appreciated. My book is nothing if not
an attempt to reveal the true importance of that Law. That Law demands that
there be a *single and universal measure of time**, the age of the universe, result-

* Please, see at the end of the letter.

ing in (a) a decreasing velocity of light, (b) non-conservation of energy, (c) a universe such that its front expand with the velocity of light within the surrounding void and (d) a drastic revision of our understanding of “standard” rods and clocks. How far these are from the premises of the current theories you know too well. Therefore, it is no good saying that general relativity recovers the (mere) form of the Newtonian gravitational potential. A correct general theory *cannot* leave *anything* unaccounted for.

Current quantum mechanics was based on the inability to produce a physical model of the electron in the atom. That our premises of the Rutherford atom and the Bohr electron may really be at fault and that these premises must be questioned before an *impeccable physical* model can be produced has not been given due consideration. I do not have to repeat the still unresolved logical problems of the current theory. Suffice it here to say that the book contains a new model of the electron capable of producing an expandable Rydberg-like expression that explains the spectra of *all* atoms based on a *one only* quantum number per electron; and in energy levels far from ionization, on a one only quantum number per *atom*. This in full accord with the far-reaching effects of Newton’s Law of Gravitation and without logical inconsistencies. The uncertainty principle is eliminated as a fundamental law of Nature. Instead, Nature establishes a single, strict, definite and universal-age-dependent quantity of least action controlling *all* processes. Indeterminacy results as a limitation of “experimentation” due to the existence of this fundamental least action law, in the sense that no physical system can interact escaping this law. In other words, while the structure is definite as revealed from the spectra, its experimental verification must remain uncertain.

These findings establish *as a fact* that the Laws are Natural (not man-made) and intelligent in the extreme. The analysis of the Laws shows them to be independent of the nature of the ultimate true atom and imposed upon it. Nature is what it is because both “atoms” and Laws are what they are. Further, the analysis demonstrates that the Laws *cannot* have been instituted, imposed and maintained from within the material universe: An extra-universal, immaterial Authority solely capable of the revealed intelligence, institution, imposition and maintenance *is logically needed*. This necessity is inescapable.

Perhaps, it is the latter inevitability and the current unwillingness to admit it publicly that are the true cause for the treatment my book has received so far. Now that necessity causes me to address you directly, it remains to be seen whether you at least will at last be able to produce the refutation that I have been seeking, or, if refutation is not objectively possible, whether you will be willing and courageous to go against the current. Only objective necessity forces these stark alternatives. Intellectual research cannot stop, nor its findings be kept secret merely because they conflict with established prejudices.

During the next few months it might be better, should you want to write to me, to use the address: 45 Sporadon St., Athens, 11361, Greece. I will appreciate receiving confirmation of receipt.

Most sincerely,

* The notion of the relativity of time is based solely on Einstein's 1905 statement: "Between the quantities x , t , and τ , which refer to the position of the clock, we have, evidently, $x = vt$ and $\tau = (1 - v^2/c^2)^{-1/2} \cdot (t - vx/c^2)$. Therefore, $\tau = t(1 - v^2/c^2)^{-1/2} = \dots$, hence it follows that ..." (On the "*Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies*", §4). The first of these equations indeed marks the distance x , from the origin, travelled by the moving clock, as measured in the stationary system, but the second equation is ONLY a repetition of one of the Lorentz transformation equations derived earlier. As a result, the x contained in the second equation ONLY refers to the POSITION OF THE LIGHT FRONT as measured in the stationary system; in polar coordinates this position is $x_{ph} = ct \cos \alpha$ where α is the angle between *any* particular direction and the x -axis. So, there is NO justification for equating (and thus eliminating) the two x -s, which is exactly what Einstein has done!!! Einstein's "Therefore ..." statement is entirely ILLEGITIMATE! Yet, this greatest blunder in the history of science has been accepted without reservation!!!

A paper of mine, On the Relativity of Clocks, received by the Physical Review on Apr. 10, 1987 and coded as SD3605D, containing a detailed analysis of Einstein's 1905 notions on the measurement and relativity of time was rejected "because the journal was not a suitable vehicle for my paper because they no longer published papers on relativity and as a result they did not even send my paper for review"!!! These unbelievable statements were made to me over the phone by Mrs. Plonski on May 29, 1987. (On my asking, she also *declined* to suggest some other "suitable" journal!). I asked that all these statements be repeated in writing; but their letter of June 1, 1987 only stated that my paper was "not considered suitable for publication in the Physical Review". Please note the shift in the statement of "suitable" from the journal to the paper! Speaking of relativity!

I must ask you to consider whether these are legitimate means of protecting blunders of this magnitude. Others, to whom I complained, have remained silent. I only mention Drs. Penzias and Hohenberg of the AT&T Bell Labs, who have received both my book *and* a copy of the paper since Feb. 1988 and have yet to refute either though challenged to do so, as well as to take any positive steps in case of failure to produce refutation as I requested of them upon their honor.

N. B. Neither this nor another letter inquiring after the fate of this one were ever answered!

Re: RESPONDING TO PROF. HARRISON

Prof. E. Harrison
Astronomy Program
517 Lederle Graduate Research Tower B
University of Massachusetts,
Amherst, MA 01003

June 24, 1988.

Dear Prof. Harrison:

Belatedly, I thank you for your letter of February 15, 1988 and the materials you were so kind to send me. I wonder whether subjecting radiation to the Carnot cycle within a box of perfectly reflecting walls is really legitimate when it comes to calculating the apparent brightness in the box. Shouldn't the images contribute to the apparent brightness? But this surely is a minor point, relatively.

If you did try, you must have found it impossible to locate a copy of my book "Principia Physica Universi". The reason is that the book is being suppressed. Even as they cannot refute it, recipients so far prefer to remain silent on the huge issues discussed in it, scientific and philosophical. journals refuse to review it, publishers and retailers to market it, libraries to put it on the shelves even when offered it as a gift!!!

Now you will have an opportunity to find out for yourself whether or not the book deserves this kind of treatment.

Should you want to write to me during the next few months, please use the address: 45 Sporadon St., Athens 11361, Greece. Please, confirm receipt of this package.

Sincerely yours,

Re: PROF. HARRISON'S SECOND REPLY

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS Department of Physics and Astronomy
AT AMHERST

Astronomy Program
517G Lederle Graduate Research Tower B
Amherst, MA 10003

15 September 1988

Dr. George Stavropoulos
3 Renda Place
Green Brook, NJ 08812

Dear Dr. Stavropoulos:

Thank you for your letter and your comment about radiation in a cavity. The images in the reflecting walls are very important and are the reason why the radiation in the cavity is the same as in unbounded space. This is shown, using detailed balancing, in my *Cosmology* book.

Your book *Principia Physica Universi* that arrived in late June is impressive and beautifully printed and bound. I failed to acknowledge receipt immediately because I intended first to read it. But much of my time this summer has been occupied on matters that took me away from Amherst and I have had little opportunity to study it at leisure. My preliminary impression is that we have many disagreements. Unfortunately, to make impact, a scientist nowadays must offer modest contributions and not revolutionary ideas.

Yours sincerely,

AUTHOR'S COMMENT: The entire debate with Professor Harrison has been as to whether we may regard Planck's black body and the blackness at night of the universal backdrop in the same terms. My position is that we may *not*! For

the following reasons: (a) Planck treated his “black body” essentially as a hole of *fixed dimensions* into which, he considered he could, at will, from a tiny hole, pour energy (*regarded conserved*) that, however, could *not* escape through that very same hole; and he proceeded to study the behavior of the *total and believed constant (until some new addition) energy* in the hole under the general understanding at the time that energy in however small amounts could be engaged in reactions. It was only as a result of his finding that this understanding could not be supported by the experimental findings that he *reluctantly* introduced the notion of action expressed in terms of what has since been considered as the universal constant of action h . Be it noted, in addition, that, at the time, the universe was also regarded to be of fixed dimensions. (b) Today, we *know* that the universe expands, we still generally believe that energy in it conserves, we observe its backdrop black, and, I guess for this last reason, Prof. Harrison at least regards the Universe as a huge black hole, yet much in the way Planck regarded his. Our present perplexity as regards the Universe is that we *cannot* understand it in the light of our *present* assumptions, that *have totally ignored the constraint imposed upon it and us by the dimensional analysis of Newton’s law of gravitation, the inescapable consequences of which, conflicting with our present assumptions* I examined in detail in my first book “*Principia Physica Universi*”.

[Upset horribly by its findings, the scientific community, *unable to contest them*, has done all it could *not to allow* the contents of that book, that overthrows its present assumptions, from becoming public knowledge. The present book is the *incontestable presentation of that attempted suppression*].

Attempts have been made (e.g., by Steven Weinberg), *totally against the very essence of Science* to present as part of it what *cannot* be part of it, for the *sufficient* reason that, by *common admission* can *never* be subjected to examination!: The latest attempt states that the space *beyond* the limits of our Universe expands faster than the velocity of light, and that it is only as a result of this *supposed* “fact” that we cannot see beyond, and as an observed result the backdrop looks black, whereas otherwise it ought to have been *blindly white and hot* under the further *unscientific* assumption of the existence of a Universe of Universes being out there since all back eternity! I suspect that, if I am not mistaken, even Prof. Harrison’s conception is not totally foreign of that more general “understanding”. *But not all “black” mentioned in science is the same black*, however much the scientists like to stress the continuity of present-day science!

In light of the findings based on the dimensional analysis of Newton’s law, as there is *no* limit to distance over which Newton’s law applies, *no matter anywhere* escapes its purview, and thus *neither the clutches of the force of its dimensional analysis*. As a consequence, Newton’s law applies to *all matter present anywhere at all*! So that, even if we could see all the way out to the *present* expanding front of the Universe, *the space beyond being empty would of necessity appear black*. We must understand that *what we truly see is light*, that alone excites our eyes and instruments. Black is the absence of light and we “see” black only when the “black” we see is intoned by objects emitting *light*. But in addition there is another constraint: *The farthest we can see in an expanding universe is as far as the universal age allows*, the first part of which was spent by the observed body to reach from the *common* center of expansion

the site at which it is now being observed, and the second part of which was spent by light to reach us from the just said site to the site *we are now located*; the sum of these two parts of time being the present age of the Universe. So, *we only can see part of the Universe, and only objects emitting light*. And absolutely nothing more! All else is, of necessity nonsense, unless it follows the Logical sequence of conclusions based on the dimensional analysis of the only truly universal law we know, namely, that of Newton's expression of gravitation! Be it noted that Prof. Harrison did *not* return any comment on the contents of "*Principia Physica Universi*", other than that contained in his letter of September 15, 1988.

51

Re: SECOND LETTER TO DR. GAVALAS

Dr. George R. Gavalas
3439 N. Marengo
Altadena, CA 91001

June 21, 1989.

Dear George,

It is almost two months since I promised to send you a copy of my book. How time flies! Of course I did not forget. I only wanted to organize and put some remaining ideas flashing through my mind out of the way, which I now have done in the form of a manuscript for a new book, before I could sit down and pick up again the thread from where I left off in my letter of March 26, 1986.

By July '86, I became persuaded that nobody would stick his neck out and offer an endorsement for that manuscript. So, I went to Athens where I had the book printed at my own expense. In December '86 I returned and started the effort to get the book reviewed in the scientific press. I really was *very naïve*! They all declined to review it and flatly refused to tell me why, claiming prerogative even on that score! [The Middle ages are *only supposedly* past! Inquisition was *never* abolished! Its lesson was indeed very well learned by all who have a dubious interest they want protected from the public consciousness!—Comment added during collection of all this material for this publication.] Some in very high places did not even thank me for sending them copies. I do not want to burden you with details and names. I sent notices to a considerable number of physics and astronomy professors all over. None responded. I have been assured that the physics community is so closely knit that they all knew very quickly what was going on. So, the reasons for their refusing to review and even acknowledge the book are no longer unfathomable.

Let me put it all to you from a different but illuminating perspective: When we were young, we were curious about things and wanted to learn as well as become able to earn a living through what we could learn. This, I suppose, and in this order was what drove us to university studies. Then, when we got our first degrees, we had learned enough to begin earning a living, but nowhere enough to satisfy the thirst of the soul. It was at this stage that we left for postgraduate studies. I suppose the same happens with all those who pursue such studies. But then something must be snapping. Perhaps, too much knowledge going into

ones's head at a still young age, without any wisdom, the fate of the young Ph.D. is an awful thing indeed. From then on, things can only go downhill, it seems: People get in the grind and lose the "romanticism" about knowledge. Knowledge, a mere tool, becomes its own objective! Wisdom is out! So, people become "professional". They begin seeking social "recognition" for their already acquired knowledge. The thirst of their souls becomes satiated at the very moment they should be becoming ever more aware of how really tenuous what we profess to know on the subject of deep questions really is. Other feelings get into the play. Ἀρχομανία in the industry and πνευματική ὑπεροψία in academia. Arrogance is specifically endemic among the theoretical physicists. We had met one or two of them in the army and could tell how pompously they looked at the "practical" men, the "engineers".

It all goes back to the sublime messages one receives from his professors. Ours were practical men of action interested in building things economically for efficient use. They did not have to give us the details of the fundamentals, which they themselves did not know. For them it was good enough that things worked if the engineer followed the "rules". To a philosophically inclined engineer, this conveys the sublime message of adequacy but strictly only within the limits of experiment, while leaving open the door below: At first sight, any number of explanations, or theories can be accepted as long as they agree with the experiment within the limits of practical verification. That something has been found to be constant to within, say, $\pm 10^{-6}$ even over 50 years is not license in the eyes of the engineer for thinking it constant to within $\pm 10^{-\infty}$ for all eternity. A true variation of, say, $\pm 10^{-8}$ per century certainly complies with the measured "constancy" of $\pm 10^{-6}$ per 50 years. So, the engineer is not really impressed with the absolute "constancy" theories all too easily constructed on the evidence of such meagre measurements as "constant to within $\pm 10^{-6}$ per 50 years", say. Also, the engineer, knowing from his own professional experience that nothing is done unless it is purposively done, does not foreclose the possibility that among all those theories, that one is the correct theory that does not neglect anything at all and that does not conflict at all with the rest of the entire structure. It is *bad* engineering practice to attempt to fit square pegs into round holes and even to think that things can at base have such an explanation!

In other words, this conveys the sublime sense of an orderly *engineered* world, whether it be buildings, or machines, or leaves looked under the microscope, or the mechanism of the inner ear, or of the eye, or crystals, or atoms, *all they way down* to the fundamental Democritean atom. The engineer who really wants to learn how to make things, and make them perfect, walks away also with the desire to know how to make a crystal, or an atom, or an inner ear or an eye and he is *not* persuaded that there is down under a level of construction where things can no longer get constructed, engineered, but simply happen relativisti-

cally, indeterministically, or by chance. On the construction site, nothing that results in order rather than chaos ever happens by chance. He is a thoroughly silly engineer, unfaithful to his profession of things happening *only* as a result of conscious and strenuous ordering and manipulation, who is willing to accept the thesis of things at some lower level happening by chance and for no reason, no objective. Every good engineer always has both a clear reason and a clear objective. The conscientious engineer *is thus protected* from making such sweeping statements on the supposedly “constructive” effects of pure chance, by the consciousness of his own limitations in the knowledge of things as they truly are and operate down to the true Democritean atoms, and by his practical experience, never-ever, confuted, that order never results spontaneously from chaos, *never*, that is, *without law*. Probability *follows* engineering, as engineering *follows* the laws of construction. In other words, the “engineering imperative” requires that, ultimately, *before anything gets constructed*, the Mind *must* do its own work, even if yet only conceptually at this stage, its own δημιουργικὸν ἔργον. The need for Δημιουργὸν *follows stepwise* from the inescapable “engineering imperative” of first putting things in order in the Mind before they are built ordered on the “ground”. The pillars of the Temple of Poseidon at Sounion are *not* like the Grand Canyon, the chance works of natural forces, but works of the *mind*! So, too, when the Δημιουργὸς builds with the Democritean “stones”, He still builds with a Plan He already has in His Mind, i.e., with laws of construction *entirely of His own devising*. Will you say that if not the laws, then the Democritean atoms need not have to be themselves constructed? But how come not? That they are *all* alike (which *truly is* the simplest case) requires that they all by *law* (the law of their similarity) have been made alike. In the opposite logical extreme, not even two of them could be alike, for *how* without a law do you limit at all the chances so that even only two of them could be “made” alike? So, the law is needed before even the Democritean atoms can be produced. If those stones are not alike, you need additional laws to establish their categories, and how the different stones are to relate to similar and dissimilar stones. Such complication, though not forbidden, in principle, must be accounted for by the need for things finally to be done that cannot be done with only one kind of stones. “Engineering economy” requires that you exhaust the limits of possibility of things to be done with only one kind of bricks before you make a second kind of bricks. But this essentially demonstrates that the engineer did not early on think well enough of what he had in mind ultimately to construct, *before*, that is, he built the building stones, for had he done that he would have designed the stones identical yet suitable for *all* things he had in mind to make with all the same material out of which he built even those stones.

It is thus that the “engineering prerogative” and the “engineering economy” enter the picture of the World. As of yet, we have no way of deciding wheth-

er ὁ Δημιουργός ἐστιν ἔσω- ἢ ἔξω-κοσμικός. An ἔσω-κοσμικός Δημιουργός is (about) what Spinoza had in mind, though I think you will agree that He should be able to operate on and arrange *even his own only material self*, itself made up of so “many different-yet-alike Democritean” atoms[in a *cover-all-possibilities-case*, at least for their being able to co-operate with each other in order to make Him whole]. How and when the “engineering imperative” and “engineering economy” come into play in such a case is not at all clear, but if God is only the World, this point too *has to be decided and must be written in the record of things as they exist!* But, I submit, this does not have to be thought out in detail by us, except only if and when it is shown that the world of matter is able on its own to establish laws and obey them. If the world is shown unable of this (in this case *internal*) requisite (because the requisite itself *cannot* be eliminated), it is only the *internal character of the requisite that must be rejected*, and *not*, for the sake of keeping it all “internally” (so that we may dispense with the need for the Creator), the very idea of law, which is what is being done by the theoretical physicists through their concoction of *chance without law down to the fundamental level*. In other words, because Law is an *absolute* engineering requisite, *if it is not internally imposed, it is necessarily imposed externally*, i.e., παρ’ Αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἔξω-κοσμικοῦ Δημιουργοῦ (under the understanding of the term κοσμικός as here pertaining solely to the world of matter).

This is a thinking engineer’s approach to Theology, and unless it can be refuted as basically flawed, I do not see how it can be considered inferior to the traditional approach to Theology, whether theistic or atheistic. At least an engineer’s Theology has the fundamental advantage of being built squarely and concretely on Reason, just as Plato’s was; in a way a theologian’s “theology”, whether theistic or atheistic is *not*, being mostly an emotional and sentimental mixed heap, that can be illogical in an infinite number of ways! It is the latter “theology” that nearly *all* the people have in mind and to it do they react, even when *it* is *not* meant. And yet, it is the former, the *Logical Theology*, that even “learned” people confuse with the latter, thus exposing themselves as being only “learned”, which they would never do *if they were truly learned!*

And so, whatever we discover to be Reasonable, all still hidden relationships in the material world, not one of them was unforeseen by the Creator. At least one thing is thus quite clear from the beginning: *Nothing unreasonable* can possibly tie the hands of the Creator. That it can *is* a contradiction in terms. He *cannot* be the Creator unless He *creates*, and He *cannot* create unless He *is Free!* And because He *has* created the world, He has *ordered* the World. In other words, the World, because it is created, contains the precise, exacting and absolute order in and with which the Creator built it.

Relativity as the fundamental unknowability of what comes before and what after another thing is *not in and cannot be part of the design* of an Engine-

er, and thus it *does not* exist in God's design of the world. Similarly with a quantum mechanics that admits as basic the element of chance. "Chance" is *our* interpretation of how things look to us from the distance as they operate out of our view, yet based on the law built into them. The law is never thereby made redundant. The kinetic theory of gases and statistical mechanics subsume the existence of law. But quantum mechanics seeks to deny the law as fundamental even as it accepts that chances obtain strictly subject to the Heisenberg principle; that as such *is* a law surpassing and constraining the absolute freedom of chance! This requires, however, a sophomore "Creator" who knows how to impose laws even as limits on how things happen by chance; which chance, without law at its own base, must be unknowable even to him, yet who is unwilling or unable to build things such as to behave responsibly in *every* instance and not only as *subsumed* under the kinetic theory of gases or statistical mechanics. Worse yet if things, as quantum theory says, are intrinsically unknowable: how did God make them? And if "God" is *this* world of intrinsically unknowable particles, how does he understand himself? In no case can the Creator be viewed as above the Logical constraints imposed upon the Engineer. No engineer can construct things about which he does not know anything. No engineer can even be an engineer unless he comprehends himself, his own engineering principles at least in the very minimum. So, too, with the Creator. [Are we to deny that the world *is indeed engineered down to the very deepest level*? Have the atheists *never* seen a flower?]

It follows that the engineer through the consciousness of his own position is constrained to think of the world as the ultimate yet solidly *Logical* engineering problem ever faced, and to reject *all* theories that are intrinsically contrary to the engineering imperative. Socrates and Plato knew fully the logical necessity of this even as they did not express it in the same language.

But this is not how the arrogant physics professor sees the world. To him, what is beyond his ken is worthless and "silly", below his elevated status, just as the "sour" grapes for the old fox of Aesop! Because things have preexisted and thus have been engineered before the theoretician ever came into being, the latter for his arrogance, for believing his own theorizing about things to be superior to engineering the things themselves as they truly exist, has declared the entire world as free of thought preexisting his own! God is out, Creation as the handiwork of God is out, simply because the arrogant physics professors would die of embarrassment on having to admit that God made the world as the Perfect Engineer, that is, entirely free of relativity and chance! This is why they refuse to review the book and they act as if it and the problems it poses do not exist!

In the book, you have an opportunity to read how and why the Michelson-Morley experiment does *not* support the theory of relativity, contrary to what *they* have said. You will see how and why the velocity of light is *not* constant, as they want to assume, how and why the energy is *not* conserved but is vanishing

according to law in a material world that by design is incapable of even saving itself from that certain catastrophe, thus asking us to concentrate our attention on the permanent things of the Spirit, now that the world of matter smells of corruption through the gradual dissipation of energy! You will see how and why the current quantum theory *is* incompatible with the expanding universe and how a quantum theory can be made compatible. You will also see how and why the deep questions are seamless and carry over from the world of matter to the world of the Spirit, because they are questions posed by the Spirit in the first place. But all this, the arrogant professors will not acknowledge!

In addition, I want you to pay attention to the following, not included in the book: In his original paper or 1905, Einstein posited the equations of relativity in the form of the system of equations

$$\begin{aligned}x^2 + y^2 + z^2 - c^2 t^2 &= 0 \\ \xi^2 + \eta^2 + \zeta^2 - c^2 \tau^2 &= 0,\end{aligned}\tag{a}$$

each of which he claimed to be simultaneously true for each of two systems K and K', in uniform rectilinear motion relative to each other. The Lorentz transformations are the relationships that transform these equations to each other. So far, the defense of relativity (if not also the attack against it) has been seen as a matter of the internal consistency of these transformations, and has not examined the question of whether or not the system of Eqs.(a) is permitted in the first place: If light in vacuo propagates as a perfect spherical front, it constitutes a hard fact of nature in B. Russell's sense of the term, i.e., as a fact not to be argued away in any way at all. But so too, then, is the center of the sphere—an equally hard fact of Nature. Then, the fact that light propagates in vacuo independently of the motion of the source can only mean that the spherical front is expanding about a *stationary* center, or else the entire spherical light front partakes in the motion of its center! So, at best, only one of Eqs. (a) is valid and then *provided that the origin of coordinates remains at the center of the spherical light front*. But if so, the system of Eqs. (a) *cannot* be written, the Lorentz transformations *cannot* be derived and relativity theory *cannot* get started!

Yet, Einstein started it, and the theoreticians and all those who liked a relativistic “philosophy” have bought it and sold their souls to it! You will get yet another surprise when you think of the following: In §4 of his 1905 paper, Einstein used the system

$$\tau = \beta(t - vx/c^2)\tag{b}$$

$$x = vt,\tag{c}$$

to obtain $\tau = \beta(t - v^2t/c^2) = \beta^{-1}t$, and thus to argue for the relativity of time. Of them, (b) comes straight out of the Lorentz transformations, and therefore, in it, the quantities t , τ and x have the *very same* significance as in Eqs. (a), i.e., they apply to the light front. Thus x in Eq.(b) is the x -coordinate of the *light front* at time t . But Eq. (c) applies only to the origin of K' as seen from K relative to

which it moves with velocity v . So, what Einstein did was to write Eqs. (b) and (c) as a system, i.e., to confuse and equate the two x -s! Since all points on the light front are equivalent, consider for simplicity the point $(x = ct, 0, 0, t)$ at which the front intercepts the x -axis at time t , and compare with it the point $(x = vt, 0, 0, t)$ which is the coordinate of the origin of K' at time t . In effect, Einstein equated those two points!!! In the general case, he equated the point $(x = vct \cos \alpha, 0, 0, t)$ of the light front to the point $(x = vt, 0, 0, t)$! What deserves only zero for grade, in 1905, was printed in the scientific press as a scientific theory of the relativity of time, and has since been accepted as such by the brightest minds!!!

In April 1987, I sent a paper to the Physical Review making among others the above two points of objection. Two months later and only after I called them, I was told (an obvious excuse) that they no longer published papers on relativity and so they did not even send the paper for review!!! I requested that they put all this in writing; as well as tell me which in their opinion was a suitable journal that still published papers on relativity. To the second request they totally refused to respond [both orally and in writing!]. As for the first, they only managed to put in writing that my *paper* was not suitable for publication! By this ruse, they avoided the obligation to produce reasons for their rejection! Now, George, tell me if the above two points (or in the very least the second, without dismissing the gravity of the first also) do not constitute the most major blunder in the history of science! Yet, behind it have all the arrogant professors of physics rallied! A year ago, I sent a copy of the book together with a letter making the same argument (of course minus the comments on the physics professors!) to S. W. Hawking in Cambridge, England. In August, I sent him another letter asking him to tell me whether he got the first *registered* package, offering to send him another copy if he had not received the first. He did not reply to it either!!! You tell me whether these people are not all involved in the grandest conspiracy ever concocted, in which they have arrogated themselves as the sole judge and jury!!!

In view of the above arguments, only idiots can advance as defense that the experimental findings exonerate the theory. Students do *not* get passing marks for a correct solution *mistakenly* arrived at! So, the experiment only points to facts, *beyond* the corpus of the theory.

So, here you have it all, George, and can decide for yourself. I only hope you (sounding even more of a Greek than I, for I have been totally disillusioned, seeing *all* that goes on everywhere) have retained your intellectual independence to think responsibly for yourself, rather than letting yourself be carried by the current. The duplicity, the cynicism, the bigotry, the arrogance, the phony intellectualism of our contemporaries, especially of the most "learned" ones, presenting far less than half truths and cheap falsehoods as the Truth, only in order to exploit the uncomprehending common people in a myriad imaginative ways, have become much too much for me to take it any longer. If you think the book is

revolutionary, not only for making the physical, logical and philosophical points it makes, but also for the courage of stating flatly that God as the Creator Spirit exists, because the material world irrefutably speaks of its Creator yet does not produce Him from within it, you must see a new manuscript that minces no words in exposing the faulty reasoning, arrogance, intellectual dishonesty and flat out immorality of our intellectual and spiritual leaders. We now have reached the age that places *us* at the head—also of the fish! If the world rots, it is only because *we* at its head do nothing about it!

I also hope you will forgive my frankness. I fear I have lost most of my ability to be “diplomatic”, that is, to skirt the Truth, by leaving the important stuff unsaid, of which our corrupted and “sophisticated” but only *sophomoric* *sophistical* age is so “artistically” able! You and I, in our youth shared the same bench; I cannot be unfrank with you.

My best regards to your family.

Best friendly wishes,

N. B. Very slightly edited for the benefit of the average reader.

Re: FIRST LETTER TO PROFESSOR NYCHIS

Prof. Peter Nychis
17 Apple Crest Road,
Weston MA 02193

May 10, 1990.

Dear Professor Nychis:

I have been advised to write to you for your having earned the reputation of a very strict, yet, very inspiring teacher. What concerns me greatly, which I am told plays up your alley, is the state of the purity of the Christian message. I trust you will agree that God has never done anything in vain. Therefore, the fact that the earliest and still surviving Christian writings and the oldest extant corpus of the Old Testament were all in Greek is of a unique significance placing a very great burden on those who regard themselves the legitimate heirs of those writings, who today are the Greek Orthodox Church; or, rather, those members of it that still strive to keep pure the Tradition of Orthodox Faith, regardless of the “theological” fads and fashions that come and go.

Before proceeding, let me give you the definition of the term Orthodox [as used in TheoLogy], which *alone*, to my mind, can stand the *absolute* test: Orthodox is *not* the conventional, or the [once] agreed upon, or the now fashionable, or the traditional. But *only* the *absolutely true and correct*, which as such can only be [the] *one and forever invariable and eternal* presentation of God’s Law and our Faith in Him. We must distinguish forthrightly between on the one hand the *absolute* Perfection of God and thus also of His Law and Will and of the absolutely perfectly defined ἐν Λόγῳ Λόγου ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ, which are *objective* realities far beyond man, and which man can only dimly understand while remaining imperfect; and on the other hand the perfectible but still not quite perfect, not yet perfect in all respects man’s view of Him and of His Law and Will. Unless we admit this distinction, indeed we abolish the function of the Παράκλητος, and that is certainly an unforgivable sin against the Holy Spirit. That function, then, is to guide us gradually to an ever more perfect understanding (thus our perfectibility) of the Perfect God. It would thus be patently unOrthodox of the Orthodox to state that they already hold Orthodoxy in her complete perfection as she already stands. To insist on the latter view is to contain the Infinite God within the finite limits of understanding of which alone the imperfect man [of the past and present day] is capable. If St. Paul himself had the

humility to state that ἐκ μέρους γὰρ γινώσκουμεν καὶ ἐκ μέρους προφητεύομεν· ὅταν δ' ἔλθῃ τὸ τέλειον, τότε τὸ ἐκ μέρους καταργηθήσεται, *because βλέπομεν γὰρ ἄρτι ὡς δι' ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι, τότε δὲ ὡς πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον*, it certainly would be arrogant of any subsequent Christian to claim a better vision without a correspondingly greater faith shown λόγῳ τε καὶ ἔργῳ and a greater revelation of God by the Spirit, τὸ γὰρ Πνεῦμα τὰ πάντα ἐρευνᾷ, ὡς καὶ τὰ βάθη τοῦ Θεοῦ. Nevertheless, the work of the Παράκλητος among us can only begin to be accomplished by the originally individual εἰσήγησις by a single person of a deeper understanding of God's Truth, upon which the Mystical Body of the Church of Christ subsequently deliberates to form a more fully informed ἐν Πνεύματι Ἀγίῳ body of Faith. The original εἰσήγησις is necessarily a function of a single individual (*not* of a committee, *nor* of the "Church") εἰσηγουμένου under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. It is then the duty of the Mystical Body (i.e., the Church) of Christ to accept and perfect the εἰσηγούμενον, if advancing the purpose of the Holy Spirit, which it shall always do when the εἰσηγούμενον is indeed from the Holy Spirit, or to reject the εἰσηγούμενον if it can be shown not to be from the Holy Spirit, notwithstanding the claim of the original εἰσηγητοῦ. In light of which, far be it from me to suggest that we revise what the Orthodox Church ἔξέλθῃ ἐκ τοῦ ληθάργου καὶ τοῦ φόβου, οὐ γὰρ πᾶν τι κείμενον καλῶς κείται, in order that she re-examine certain issues that for the lack of sufficient understanding of the true significance of the terms of language unavoidably used have to this day been doctrinally ill-defined to the greater detriment of the Orthodox Faith and of the purpose of the Holy Spirit's action among men. To shrink from this task by insisting that the sole function of the Orthodox Church is to preserve the πατρῶα exactly as already received without further improvement is not only to abdicate the true mission of Orthodoxy in the world, but also to suggest that the work of the Holy Spirit among men has already been completed, i.e., perfected; but then we are faced with the *fact* that the End has *not* yet come: And there can be *no* answer justifying the delay, if indeed the work of the Holy Spirit has already been perfected, given the fact that God does *nothing* in vain. In other words, given the delay of the End, we *are* obliged to conclude that the work of the Holy Spirit is *not yet* completed, and since it can only be completed by *us* the Orthodox, the true faithful, *we* are obligated to conclude that *we have not yet done our work*, which places upon our shoulders the complete *responsibility* for the delay of the Second Coming and for the continuing blasphemy of God!!! Are we, in this light, prepared to accept the full burden of our sitting back on our hands and doing nothing???

To use St. Paul's words, "ἔχων τὸ μαρτύριον τῆς πίστεως ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει", "πολλὴν παρρησίαν ἔχω ἐν Χριστῷ" ἐν τῷ λέγειν τοῦτο, *be-*

cause I am persuaded that τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐποχῆς ἐκείνης ἀρξάμενον “μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας ἥδη ἐνεργεῖται” κατὰ τρόπον πλησιάζοντα τὸ τέλειον, τὸ δὲ τέλος οὐπω ἔρχεται ἐὰν τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας μὴ πρῶτον πληρωθῇ, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως. Διότι ἡ πίστις οὐκ ἔσται τελεία ἂν οἱ μὲν πιστοὶ οἱ ἀπομένοντες μὴ σχῶμεν τελείαν τὴν πίστιν, οἱ δὲ ἄνομοι τελείαν τὴν ἀπιστίαν, πάντες δὲ ἐν ἐπιγνώσει. But unfortunately, it does not seem to me that today the Orthodox Church, the only remaining true [to the extent that she truly is] Apostolic Church continues to prepare the ground for the Day of the Lord in the way just described, as she should. Rather, she seems to stick to the external form, and much watered down at that, of the πατρῷα without much comprehension of why even this external form should be as it is. Already, another season of Πάσχα has come and gone and once again the proceedings did not appear to constitute, far [if anything] more than a mere repetition of received tradition, a clarion declaration of unshakable informed faith in what has always been Ἰουδαίοις μὲν σκάνδαλον Ἑλλήσι δὲ μωρία. Perhaps, the ecclesiastical authorities may regard this as yet another “successful” season—the churches were once more filled!!! And yet, the Orthodox τρέμει ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῇ Θεῷ ἀνοχῇ, and all the more does he agonize whether he alone and unaided can carry the heavy burden of faith, when all around him seem to drown in faithlessness and indifference. But even this is perhaps as it should be. As Christ Himself carried the Cross abandoned by all, so too must we, each of us, carry his own cross as if he were alone in the world as the only remaining believer. Still, to the extent that there is still an identifiable Mystical Body of believers, the mystery of faith calls for each one to assist and get assisted by each other in the effort to perfect our faith and our witness of Christ to the world, before we, each alone, carry his own cross on his shoulders.

Neither the mystery of faith, nor the mystery of lawlessness can be completed without the latter having the external appearance of all propriety and κατὰ κόσμον γνώσεως καὶ ἐπιστήμης. The greatest deception must first deceive itself and then it must appear to the world as the manifest “truth”, though it is but a shameful yet shamelessly well-dressed lie, the antithesis itself of the Truth. Only when the mystery of falsehood appears at the very brink of final triumph, only when the mystery of faith of the last remaining faithful appears at the brink of final extinction, then and only then shall the Day of the Lord come. And only then shall that other famous promise ἀπολῶ τὴν σοφίαν τῶν σοφῶν καὶ τὴν σύνεσιν τῶν συνετῶν ἀθετήσω find its perfect fulfillment, for only thus shall everything in which Godless man takes vain pride in his rebellion against God, including preeminently his atheistic “knowledge” and “science”, find itself crushed to dust by God’s wisdom. It was not only for his narrowly conceived ἕνα that St. Paul could ask “ποῦ σοφός, ποῦ συζητητὴς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου; οὐχὶ ἐμώρανεν ὁ Θεὸς τὴν σοφίαν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου;” We still live, and till

Judgment shall continue to live in the same world and in the same αἰῶνα as he; and, therefore, St. Paul had consciously included the false wisdom of this entire world and this entire age. Naturally, the conceited world of lawlessness will never on its own recognize its self-deception. The great pity is that the so-called “Christian Churches”, including, I am most deeply sorry to say, the organization that gives the external appearance of the Orthodox Church, have given χούνη καὶ ὕδωρ to the “wisdom” of the “wise” and are scared to face them. And as the false “education” of this world seems to triumph, all the more do the “Churches” lose their raison d’ être, because their own top churchmen are no longer μαθηταὶ Χριστοῦ but only deceived and deceiving officials of the demonic powers of this world, and not only do they themselves not enter the kingdom of God, but far more importantly, they also prevent *knowingly, consciously* others from entering.

Perhaps nothing is more serious than the failure of the Church to explain the perceived “failure” of Christ and of St. Paul to diagnose “correctly”, so the accusation states, the much delayed and by “now very doubtful coming of the Kingdom”, which they both regarded as already upon us, given the now “indisputable” attestation of two more thousand years that “it has yet to come”!!! As we prepare to enter the third millennium, are the Christians, especially those who regard themselves Orthodox in the sense given above, prepared to see that neither Christ nor St. Paul misdiagnosed the situation? For the profane world, the closing of the millennium and the opening of another are totally without significance—all moments of time are similar! It takes spiritual eyes and fortitude to see the passing of time with the desire to re-examine oneself, to take stock of oneself, to balance the books as it were, and such fortitude is positively absent in the profane, spiritually blind world, especially when the millennia are counted since Christ, Whom the profane world shall not acknowledge, not even in name. This is not surprising. What is surprising is that the so-called “Christian Churches” are behaving in exactly the same way! So, it is not only to the world that Christ is σκάνδαλον καὶ μωρία, but also to the “Churches” that bear His name. Nothing is being done by way of taking stock of two thousand years of Christian development, nothing in the way of preparation of a meaningful celebration of the great anniversary. And nothing other can more vividly and more depressingly demonstrate the quality of faith truly practiced by the so-called “Christian Churches” today! So, if anything is to be done by way of taking stock and of a true celebration, it must be done by individuals, without “official ecclesiastical” blessing. The “Churches” have far too many other things in their minds even to remember the birthday of Christendom, thereby proving that they are *not* the Church of Christ! The task falls upon those who *truly* constitute the Church, even unbeknownst to themselves!

In order that the true faithful do this, they must see the true profound qualitative difference between time and eternity, finally freed from the entirely false

so-called conservation principles of “science”, that were only meant to turn, and have, alas, succeeded in the eyes of the world in construing matter, the created world, τὸν παρερχόμενον κόσμον τῆς φθορᾶς, into a world of absolute permanence, indeed into “God” in its own right! But only those unskilled in the sciences can fail to see the plot hiding behind those principles. Past and future belong only to time, and time is exactly what passes. Eternity is *not* the interminable passage of time of which we alone as creatures of this world have a sensory and cognitive appreciation, but only the continuous, as one indivisible entity, static, *not* flowing, διηκεῖς everpresence of God; over Whom time has no power, for it itself has been created by Him, for Whom time has no significance except only as it affects His material, this-worldly creation and the salvation of the souls of men. So, God’s present is the static and forever same Now, totally free of past and future. Of this Now, we as creatures of this world are permitted to see only a fleeting moment compressed between past and future. It is due to a fundamental failure of the [self-cultivated] human spirit to see the world of the Spirit, that exists in the permanent world of the changeless Here and Now of God, as supposedly constrained at all by the *created* category of time. When we say that God ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι παρήγαγε τὰ σύμπαντα, we surely include the category of time in the things, τὰ σύμπαντα created by God. When we say ἐλάλησας ἡμῖν ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ Ὑῖῳ Σου, δι’ οὗ καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησας, we in reality admit, if we truly mean what we say, that not only did He create the world but even time itself, or else, that καὶ has no meaning. St. John’s Gospel says that πάντα δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονε. The Genesis states that ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν. Therefore, the καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας affirms that not only τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν, not only all else πάντα ἃ γέγονε, but even time itself was created and, therefore, that it too came into being out of non-being. This is a very hard lesson to learn, and we do not seem to have learned it yet. Specifically, the so-called “science” *refuses* to learn the lesson for it immediately introduces Him on Whose sole power even time came into being out of non-being, i.e., Him Whom “science” arrogantly thought it could do without! It certainly is a profound revolution in the understanding of nearly everything that we regard as given in our culture to accept as an absolute fact of reality that time itself is also created, and therefore, that there indeed was a “time” when time itself did *not* exist!!! Yet, there is no other way in which St. Paul’s distinction πίστει νοοῦμεν καταρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας ῥήματι Θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων τὰ βλεπόμενα γεγονέναι can make sense. It is not for nothing that the distinction is made between κόσμου καὶ αἰῶνος, that despite the distinction, ὁ παρὼν αἰὼν came to signify the created world that was intended to pass. Ὡς δι’ ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι, the ancient world philosophically since Plato (in his Timaeus) and theologically since St. Paul diagnosed correctly the dependence of the world upon

time: that time rather than the world of the senses is the profounder, the more fundamental *yet still only material* reality. The world that is seen, τὰ βλεπόμενα, has been made out of non-observables, τὰ μὴ φαινόμενα. The Genesis states that καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Θεός· “γενηθήτω φῶς· καὶ ἐγένετο φῶς”, i.e., ῥήματι Θεοῦ. But St. Paul went deeper: he recognized that this world κατηρτίσθη ἐκ μὴ φαινόμενων (which included time itself), which themselves also κατηρτίσθησαν ῥήματι Θεοῦ. And since God never spells out οὐδὲ ἐν ῥήματι μὴ μόνον ἐν Λόγῳ, we are obligated to conclude that nothing which God said or made is dangling loose or purposelessly, but that everything κατηρτίσθη, i.e., was made entirely ἄρτιον and was conjoined into a unified and purposeful whole Creation. So, in the narrow sense, time itself was made along with the φῶς, ῥήματι Θεοῦ. In the wider sense, not only this world, ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος, but all the αἰῶνες also were made ῥήματι Θεοῦ. And whereas this world and this αἰὼν οὗτος σαλευθήσεται ἵνα μὴ μείνῃ τὰ σαλευόμενα, the Other World, ὁ μέλλον αἰὼν shall remain ἀμετάθετος καὶ ἀσάλευτος εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, because it was made free of time and ἵνα μείνῃ. What passes shall indeed pass, and time, the thing that itself passes more than anything else, shall indeed pass, and only God’s ἀμεταθέτως set ever-present διηνεκές shall remain; after it comes to pass ὁ ἐπήγγελτο λέγων: ἅπαξ ἔτι ἐγὼ σείσω οὐ μόνον τὴν γῆν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν οὐρανόν.

For St. Paul, looking δι’ ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι, it was correct to say πίστει νοοῦμεν [ταῦτα]. It is very likely that as regards the nature of God, to the End of this world, we shall not know much more, if we can know anything more than we already know since the days of Christ and St. Paul. But as regards the nature of this world, it does not follow that what was then νοοῦμενον πίστει shall remain so to the End. In face of the great danger that even the remaining few stand to lose their faith, in face of the arrogance and blasphemy of this κόσμου τῆς ἀπωλείας that have already reached μέχρι τρίτου οὐρανοῦ, it is absolutely safe to say that what used to be νοοῦμενον πίστει as regards this world shall become καταληπτὸν ἀποδείξει ἀκλονήτῳ before the End comes, so that the faith of the remaining few παρακληθῇ and the world of faithlessness remain ἀναπολόγητος ἐνώπιον τοῦ Κυρίου ἐν τῇ φοβερᾷ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς Κρίσεως. But how is this proof to be provided? The joyful fact is that *it has already been provided and the world of perdition is already ἀναπολόγητος!!!* The sad fact is that officials of the “Churches”, including *Bishops of the Orthodox Church*, have been notified, but rather than making the news public have instead chosen to side with the οὐκ τῆς ἀπωλείας, thereby demonstrating their true allegiance! For, going back to the fact that God never created anything in vain or out of context when He created the world, He created it with the intention that it shall pass, which is a stamp engraved upon this world and demonstrable that it is indelibly engraved upon it διὰ χειρὸς Κυρίου.

The question of whether this world of matter is or is not created by God is

therefore incontrovertibly decidable, and has already been decided in favor of creation by God, by the proper scientific examination of this world, which profane “science” has failed to conduct, and now that the findings have been presented to it, it has chosen to remain silent for lack of ἀπολογίας, *because admission of Creation is admission of the existence of God!!!* For, the proper scientific examination of the world has shown it to be dependent on Laws that have nothing to do with the *false* theories in which profane “science” takes so much pride today, on Laws that are beyond the ability of the natural universe as a whole to institute upon itself. The absolute Logicality of these Laws shows them to be the product of a Mind having the power to think all-inclusively, as well as the power to institute the world in such a way as expressly to obey these Laws. This is another way of saying that God created the entire natural world out of nothing and ordered it to function unfailingly according to these God-given Laws (*not* according to chance, as profane “science” falsely states) from which Laws absolutely nothing natural escapes. [All this has been scientifically established in my book “PRINCIPIA PHYSICA UNIVERSI” of which profane “science” has known since 1985, and rather than even attempting to refute it, as it has been challenged to do since, it has instead conspired to say nothing about it, about which whole matter I shall in this letter say nothing more].

The only spiritual purpose of such a natural universe is that man be guided by his observation of it to its and his Creator, an event that shall mark the end of the usefulness of this world, which shall mark the End itself. So, there is no question that the End shall indeed come when *all* the conditions for it (including the incontrovertible objective proof of the existence of God and the public acknowledgement of this proof) are fulfilled. Yet, this event shall mark only the final act of history as we recognize it dependent on time. It shall *not* mark the beginning of the Other World, because that World, God Himself, has no beginning, being everpresent αἰδίως εἰς τὸ διηνεκές.

So, the New Testament refers to both facts: The End of the present age shall be a fact. The διηνεκῆς παρουσία τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ γενομένης ἐμφανοῦς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις διὰ τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ Λόγου *is also an already given fact*. By His walking among us, Christ brought us the Kingdom; by our faith in Him we already partake the blessings of the Kingdom *as an Everpresent Reality*. Although in a temporal sense the final Day of Judgment is [shall be] a historical fact set out for the future day when the world shall come to its End upon the fulfillment of the conditions for it, nevertheless, in the spiritual sense, the Day of Judgment *is already upon us*, for the conditions of faith, for those who believe in Him and accept Him, and for those who already believe in His existence yet consciously reject Him, *have already been fulfilled!* Christ, διὰ τοῦ εἶναι αὐτὸν υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου, that is to say by His remaining sinless (τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐλέγχει με περὶ ἁμαρτίας;) though *fully* human [in visible form],

brought the Judgment with Him, for it could not be otherwise Logically! In a very real sense, since the days when He walked on the Earth we live the very Day of Judgment, by believing in Him, or by rejecting Him; by following His example in defeating sin, or by subscribing to it in disbelief of Him. When He re-appeared on Earth after Resurrection, was His re-appearance any less triumphant than that expected [to occur] on the Final Day? This is the era when time and eternity run parallel as it were, when the Second Coming as a *spiritual event independent of the created category of time has already happened and is happening and shall happen all at once, when Judgment is similarly and simultaneously in progress!* To see the events of time and eternity in this way, one needs to appreciate both time and eternity in their true natures, one needs to see more with the eye of the Spirit and less with the eye of the perishable flesh. In the ever-presence of eternity, all the spiritual events fuse into one, although by the ordinary time they appear to happen in sequence, some of them being already in the past and some set out to be in the indeterminate future. Only thus was it factually truthful of Christ to say “Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, σήμερον μετ’ ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ Παράδεισῳ”, i.e., *already past* the Day of Judgment, while temporally we expect it to be still in the future. Herein lies the failure of the Church to see correctly the problem of the End of the world as an event *both* of time *and* eternity, an event *both* of historically human time *and* an event in the world of the Spirit where Christ *is* already triumphant, having already defeated sin and death and returned to Glory. It takes faith [in and an understanding of the facts of the Spirit] to see how these supposedly different events are really *only* one. But the “churchmen” have today lost faith and have not seen the events in this way, for which reason alone are they themselves drowned in perplexity as regards the “failure” of Christ and of St. Paul to assess correctly the situation of the End! So, this “failure” only reflects the “churchmen’s” own failure of faith [and true vision] on account of which alone they cannot stand up to the undermining “criticisms” of those who, whether Jews or atheists, i.e., people having a vested interest in falsehood, are too quick to find fault in Christ and St. Paul; and it is on account of this failure that the “churchmen” cannot check and cannot revive the diminishing faith of the so-called “Christian” masses that have thus been left without a spiritual guide.

The second serious problem to which I here would like to draw your attention is the following: to the faithful, the similarity of the spiritual hunger of the first and the twentieth centuries is truly astounding. But so too is the misguidedness and despair of our times relative to the clarity of vision of that earlier epoch, demonstrated by the means with which we and they attempt to satisfy that hunger. Back then, the soil in which Christianity would spread its roots had been tilled by the faith in the God of the prophets, Who had created man and had made solemn promises to him, and by the unshakable faith in God’s Reason and

Justice that had been reached by the rational analysis of the philosophers, despite the counter evidence presented daily by the injustice of the world, that was seen, correctly, as only due to man's sinfulness, *not* to God's imperfection. It was by those two faiths that the Apostles and particularly St. Paul could find the voice and the fire and the persuasiveness to convert people to the new Faith, even only through a single speech; it was by those two faiths that people were indeed persuaded of the Truth of the new Faith even only after a single hearing. Today, we are no longer fired by those two faiths; we have only the written word of the Gospel that is the semantic attestation of the then living word and of the other deeds that made possible that unique and profound change in civilization. People then had absolute confidence both in God and in themselves. They knew what were the basic necessary and sufficient requirements for the Unknown God to fulfill and for the faith in Him to be absolutely justified, and they recognized them when they found them. And then, they made the new Faith their own even unto death, in the full confidence of mature Spirits ready to [let the flesh] die for what they knew fully in themselves to be the Truth. Compared to them, today's people are lost: not only do they not believe in God; they do not even believe in themselves, by which latter faith they can be guided to the former, to believing in God. And that is why they find "incomprehensible" the faith of the early Christians. But one does not ever die willingly and gladly in defense of superstition, or for what deep down one knows to be a lie, a σκάνδαλον and a μωρία. People were "scandalized" then, indeed, but they also knew where the σκάνδαλον ends and the faith in God and in oneself begins. So, it was not credulity that led people to God then, nor knowledge and "sophistication" that keeps them from Him now. If, today, we are scandalized so very much more than they and we have lost the boundary between σκάνδαλον and faith, it is not due to our greater "enlightenment" with which we foolishly comfort ourselves, but to our complete loss of confidence in the existential complete rationality of being that calls inexorably for God and ourselves as beings fully capable of such rationality, a loss that we have chosen to hide even from ourselves behind the pseudonym of "enlightenment". It is not at all an overstatement to say that, of all ages, our own is the most unphilosophical and uncritical, the one least concerned with the profound and ultimate questions of being, the one most taken in by the hollow and trashy ephemeral, even among its most learned classes. Never before have matters created as much touchiness, as much perplexity, as much embarrassment, as much shame and have been declared so totally out of bounds as matters of discussion in "civilized" circles, as they have today. When the ultimate questions of being are not investigated or discussed as a totality of thought, so much so that even Nobel laureates show themselves to be spiritual infants, a fact demonstrated by their cowardly hesitancy to face up to these questions as spiritual grownups, then indeed, it is not out of enlightenment that we act so

today, but only out of the conscious absence of any confidence in ourselves. And so indeed, despite our loss and certainly also because of it, we do indeed feel the spiritual hunger even more today than those earlier people did then. Otherwise, we would not be drawn so pitifully after every discreditable fad and fashion, ready to abandon it in short order even more dissatisfied and disgusted than before. I speak of the unexpressed in inexpressible longing of the Spirit that drives even the drifting, the discussion of which is forbidden, as well as the non-discussion of which is self-imposed, in order not to show the spiritual nakedness even of our “leaders” and of our “values”. So, today, we cannot expect to find any discussion of this hunger; we must feel it even as it remains well hidden. And so, the difference between now and then is in our inability to satisfy the hunger of our Spirit solely because we have clipped the wings of our Spirit! We depend for guidance upon people no longer able to guide, for they themselves have lost the compass; we search to find faith in the words of people no longer able to believe, but only to deceive, whose faithlessness is demonstrated through the slickness itself of their own “professional” words that are so obviously hollow; we seek prophesy in mouths where none is to be found, because it cannot dwell in hearts where the written word of God is seen merely as a non-binding “literary piece” of fallible men of another era speaking only of that era, rather than the eternal Word of God, though spoken through people admitting the “ἐκ μέρους γὰρ γινώσκουμεν ...”, though spoken in an imperfect, because it is only human, language, that nevertheless can still be understood by people only pretending “not to understand”, for whose benefit the Word of God is not ashamed to be served gradually starting very much like milk fed to infants before they can mature to receive solid food.

So, those concerned with the faithful preservation of the Gospel as an eternal document of living faith must be greatly concerned about the unwitting as well as willful misrepresentations of the original Greek text made in the standard and new translations into English. Those translations have not been in the direction of a more faithful presentation of the Faith of the Apostolic age of which the Gospel stands only as a concise signpost of the Spirit that animated the Apostles and St. Paul in particular, whom he made second only to Christ, but in the direction of “discovering” the secular, Jewish and rabbinical meaning of the words used, as if Christianity and the Holy Spirit owe any obedience to such usage and ought to restrict themselves within the confines of such limited usage! Overlooked entirely is the fact that if this principle is adhered to, the very progress of theological thought, the maturing from milk to solid food is entirely and permanently halted and stifled, not to mention that dependence on rabbinical interpretation is subject to the much later standardization of the Jewish text (the Masoretic recension), which is *not* free of anti-Christian bias, or else the Jewish religion should only have admitted, even if belatedly, its own obsolescence.

All this is particularly painful to the Orthodox Christian who is fully able to understand the fullness of the Spirit contained in the Greek original and compare it to the poverty of the translations and to the distortions of the deliberate mistranslations intended to “harmonize” the document *not* to the [otherwise *truly unknowable*] original Spirit but to some pet theory as regards improper freedoms assumed to have been taken by the Church in writing the original texts (assuming and applying the preposterous principle that the Church had had a hidden agenda which she tried to augment through the willfully deceptive composition of the documents in the Gospel Canon), when in reality the only improper freedoms taken (and the only hidden agendas) are those of the translators that are anything but guided by the Holy Spirit. To give but only one example, the epistle to the Hebrews has been rejected by the Western Christianity as being of St. Paul, despite the clear internal evidence, while ignoring the fact that surely St. Paul’s literary ability was not exhausted in the Letters to the other Churches with which he had had previous personal contact and to whom he could afford to write more freely and much less formally, in order to remind them of his oral teachings rather than to present to them a complete argument intended to overthrow an established religion, which definitely was the case of the essentially *open* Epistle to the Hebrews. Nobody but St. Paul could have addressed the Jews in their entirety as infants needing milk (as he earlier had addressed the Corinthians), and shown to them the complete fallacy of believing that human sin can be expiated by the shedding of innocent animal blood and other spiritually empty ritual offerings bought with money, *and* referred to his own imprisonment for the Gospel; which is totally suppressed in the translations. And to give, if I must, a second example, Western Christendom has felt embarrassed of the perceived acquiescence of St. Paul and of the ancient Church on the matter of slavery, and has attempted thereby to detract attention from its own culpability on this issue (that has still to be done away with from the face of the Earth), when in fact the issue could not have been dealt with any better, from the Christian perspective, than it was dealt with in the Letter to Philemon!!! So, whereas the original text of the New Testament is literally aflame with the fire of faith, that can only be sensed by those who have received the meaning of the original text with their mothers’ milk, the foreign translators, having only learned how to translate pedantically from a foreign and [believed] “dead” language and having remained strangers to the Orthodox Faith that alone can guide to the full and correct meaning of the original text, have only succeeded in producing “a translation by committee” lifeless and trite, and almost banal.

How serious the situation is can only be realized by consideration of the fact that, today, English is the universal language and from it are most translations being made into other languages in cases where direct translation from the original is no longer possible. In this respect, the absence of interest and indeed

of concern by the Orthodox Church is even more painful. Instead of herself undertaking an official Orthodox translation of the Greek text into English in a way that would do full justice to the text and to the faith, she has abandoned the translation in the hands of Catholics and ex-Catholics, not to say in the hands [also] of Jews and atheists!!!

Dissatisfied with this state of affairs, I have tried my own hand at translation, but so far only of the epistles to the Galatians, Hebrews and Philemon, and have succeeded, I think, in translating far more than the “dead” letter: Those who have made a comprehending serious effort to understand St. Paul will certainly respect his own emphasis and agree that his language is even more concise and economical than the ordinary “*κοινή*”, and assumes knowledge of facts theological and historical, and of prior teachings then fully known to the recipients of his Letters, which however are no longer immediately available to the modern reader: the Letters, in other words, were not meant to stand alone exactly as they were written but only as reminders of the Apostolic tradition of teaching the Faith principally by the living word of mouth and the living daily example of life. This is what we have lost. Besides, St. Paul’s strategic use of predicate qualifier-statements having more than one subject, his deliberate double usage of the identical second person plural present indicative and imperative, and his extensive use of the subjunctive, all of which enrich uniquely the meaning; but which are impossible to translate as concisely into English, that can only be done if one makes a conscientious deliberate effort to draw out all separate distinctions of the very same words, even if it means sacrificing the textual conciseness, even quite apart from the fact that a good number of deceptively simple-looking Greek words cannot be translated fully except only by a long series of hyphenated structures; all these are precisely those characteristics of St. Paul’s Letters which make it “so difficult and ambiguous” in the eyes of the moderns and particularly of the Westerners to understand the true meaning of the text, which was designed to be rich, but which they are unable or do not want to understand it (in its full richness) preferring and attempting instead to reduce it to the poverty of a pedantic interpretation, thereby misunderstanding both the text and the Theology! It is only by such misunderstanding that these people have succeeded in making it believed that St. Paul’s Greek is “poor”(!!!), thereby arrogating to themselves the right to interpret his Letters not infrequently in a way foreign and on occasion exactly contrary to his spirit!!! So, progress in attempting to produce a translation that takes into consideration all these matters is necessarily very slow, time consuming and exhausting. And then, I find myself wondering of the usefulness of my effort, if finally nothing comes out of it, not even in the way of its being used as a basis for further refinement.

This is a very long letter, and a very critical one of the modern condition, cultural, “scientific”, “theological”, that is thus destined not to make me many, if

any, friends! Today, far less than at any other age, people do not take kindly to even well-intended criticism. When the Holy Spirit no longer informs, that is to say, when people's lives are no longer formed around the teachings of the Holy Spirit, criticism is no longer seen as proceeding from Him, and people do not want to be criticized by the "non-expert" (as if the Holy Spirit were subject to human recognitions of profane expertise and could not blow where He will!), nor to be put in a dilemma from which they can extricate themselves only by making a *{painful}* choice. So, I will not burden you now any more by sending you any additional material. I think I should wait for your answer on the issues discussed in this letter, if you should think it worthy of an answer.

Sincerely yours,

53

Re: SECOND LETTER TO PROFESSOR NYCHIS

Prof. Peter Nychis
17 Apple Crest Road,
Weston MA 02193

June 27, 1990.

Dear Professor Nychis:

I am much concerned that a very important letter I sent you on May 10, 1990 may have not reached you. If so, please advise. For in the opposite case, and barring incapacitation, your delay to respond can only be interpreted as your unwillingness to respond positively on matters about which *even silence is indeed negative action!* Most painfully, I *must* add that, the concomitant conclusions can only provide additional proof of the accuracy of the characterization of the present age, but surely cannot make proud a man of intellect as you doubtless realize.

Most sincerely,

AUTHOR'S COMMENT: Professor Nychis, a professor of Theology, did not see it fit to respond to either of the two letters addressed to him. The Reader can decide for himself on the propriety of his *refusal* to respond, given the subjects raised in my first letter to him.

Re: LETTER TO PROFESSOR WITTEN

Prof. Edward Witten
INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY,
Princeton, NJ 08540

October 17, 1990.

Dear Professor Witten:

For a number of years now, I have been trying to find a scientist of high caliber, yet one who truly believes in God. I am very sorry to say that I have not succeeded; not, as my search indicates, because the two are incompatible, but because even scientists of high caliber, at least those with whom my search has so far brought me to contact, when it comes to discussing the question of God, exhibit the levity and superficiality characteristic of adolescents, and much less the seriousness and profundity appropriate to mature spirits. No mature scientist and intellect should tolerate himself or itself, if he found himself, or it itself, shrinking from the fullest consideration of the profoundest problem of existence. And no problem presents a better test of mature intellectuality than the problem of the existence of God, on which each generation *must* throw the light if its enlightenment, *not* the shadow of its own confusion. That today a search produces so many high-caliber scientists unable or unwilling to discuss that problem can only indicate how much we have retrogressed in intellectuality compared to all previous ages; that is altogether pitiful, given our great pride of our “freedom” to investigate and discuss anything at all, except, that is, the one question, that of God, which our “freedom” has yet to find the courage to face maturely; in the face of which, our “freedom” has yet to find the courage to liberate itself from the chains of its fears. The article on you that appeared in the Sunday Star-Ledger of October 7, 1990 has somehow renewed my hopes that I *shall* finally find in you such a scientist. If I say that it has done so but slightly, that would prejudice you, and I would probably be doing you a terrible injustice, even as I mean absolutely no offense and I truly wish that you be the first of those whom I seek. Finding from the same article that you first studied history and only later science, I am confident that you shall find the coincidence somewhat amusing that I happened to read the article just after I finished re-studying after a number of years Socrates’ Apology, and I could not help realizing the analogy as well as the basic identity of the problem that he and I, and I dare say we all, are still,

though mutely, faced with. So, I must use that adverb “but slightly” and indeed every word very carefully, leaving it to developments to decide the fairness of their use or their omission.

No, I did *not* have it as he did on the equivocal word of some oracle that I am the wisest of men! What I do have, on the unequivocal word of Logic, is that, *whatever we say* of both us and the world on the one hand and of God on the other *be absolutely consistent*. I trust that this realization, that *must remain totally uncompromised*, has *not* escaped you either and, therefore, I trust that the statements that you believe in God in an “abstract sense” and that you practice the Jewish faith *are indeed consistent in your mind* [by which I mean that you do *not* limit your faith to the *empty* daily “religious” incantations and ritual, but that you *sense the vibrant ineffable constant presence of God*]. Since it has never been said that it is no longer an element of the Jewish faith that God is a Person, as well as a Spirit, as well as the Creator of the world, I must assume that, the consistency that doubtless characterizes your [personal] faith in Him is pegged on the realization that faith in Him must be purified of anthropomorphic associations that characterize our *fallible* nature as well as are arising therefrom, and *in only this thus abstracted sense* must we focus on Him as the Perfect and Absolute Person *and* Spirit, Who created all that exists in *perfect* Wisdom and *perfect* Logic, and thus He could *not* fail to consider, *nor* did He overlook, in creating it either the least last particle that partakes in making the world, or the minutest mathematical relationship referring to its behavior towards every other particle and the world as a whole. Doubtless, you will also agree that, to say, or to insinuate, or to impugn otherwise would be blasphemy. We also would commit blasphemy if we said that God created the world in any other but the simplest, most economical and most elegant way, whether viewed mathematically-theoretically, or “engineeringly”; and not only as it looks to us as observers from within, but also and far more importantly as it serves *the purpose* of its creation. While on the latter issue, human science chooses to remain mute, on the former and specifically as it refers to the mere apprehension of the world by an observer, it has chosen to be vociferous even as it studiously overlooks the fact of the world having been engineered consistently, on which fact alone is it possible to found our search for a general theory of the world. Indeed, it would be unconscionable of us to suggest that the world as a whole has not been engineered, even as human science seeks to find the very general laws that explain everything, when we do not fail to seek the most economical engineering solutions to far far less consequential constructions that positively pale in comparison to the world as a whole. It would also be blasphemous of God, as it would assign a greater wisdom to us, thus making us appear more concerned with lesser values, than to God, who thus would be made to appear unconcerned, or even incapable of concern, for the world as a whole. I am confident that you do *not* overlook the

significance of any of these general considerations when it comes to your consuming concern for developing a consistent outlook of the world.

But this brings us to the following question: The string theory, by seeking to establish the consistency, albeit at a higher level, of relativity and quantum mechanics, seeks in effect to patch over what at first, second and even third sight not only appears to be but *is* inconsistent between the two theories. The question then is how what at a more basic level appears and is inconsistent can be elegant, and how what is inelegant, even by the mere appearance of inconsistency can be made a part of a more general consistent and elegant design. Perhaps, if we only sought to explain some human construction, this would be acceptable as a tolerable compromise given our lack of perfect wisdom. But exactly because the discussion is about the world, we *cannot* be justified by, nor consider ourselves satisfied with, merely presenting a thus *compromised* theory of the world. Rather we should consider physical reality as free of all human imperfection [or imperfection thought to exist as built-in element of the world] and thus we should not be satisfied with anything that fails to reveal an *absolute* consistency and elegance at *all* levels. For a believer in God, this has the added weight of avoiding blasphemy, for it is definitely blasphemous to say that God did not, or could not design and create the world more economically, in a manner that would totally obviate the inconsistency and inelegance of the lesser parts of His design of it, and He thus “had” to incorporate in that design both relativity and quantum mechanics. I appreciate the dilemma: To keep faith in God, or in human science. But since the very search for a better theory bespeaks of the imperfection of the latter, keeping faith in God, Who alone is able to justify the existence of the object of that search, is indeed the wiser course. Indeed a practicing believer can have no other course but to doubt the validity of *at least one* of the lesser theories, even despite its “successes”! By doing so, he at least shall save himself from the demanding yet futile effort of attempting to devise a theory that *cannot but contain within itself basic elements of falsehood*.

For where is it demonstrated, within either of the lesser theories, that they are sine qua non in God’s design of the world? The perfect centrality assigned by relativity to all observers may be wondrous as regards its seeking [*both*] to [maintain *and*] abolish the [psychological] insistence of men on being in a “better” position relative to others. But it has done absolutely nothing to establish justice in the world, for Justice *is in fact abolished* whenever any two opposite views are deemed equally justified! Moreover, it is also to be doubted as an engineering principle of construction. Since we have been altogether unable to produce or to construct any lesser system with more than one center, we *must* reject the possibility that the principle somehow applies to the world as a whole. We *must* separate reality from illusion, and things as they are from what we *unphilosophically* think we want them to be. To say that perfect multiple centrality

exists in the world, for only thus can the world appear to be the same for all, is to confuse the oneness of the law with the mere appearance of things that is not even guarded against illusion, specifically as our “view” of the world is not guaranteed free of prejudice. In no case may we insist on the oneness of appearance as the only way of guaranteeing the oneness of the law, if Logic is compromised in the process. It has been documented that Einstein had accepted as true our absolute inability to state which of two distant from the observer and each other events occurs first or second, or is exactly where in space. But that, *sufficiently by itself, disqualifies* relativity as a theory of construction of the world, as engineering requires an *absolute order of construction events*. It also compromises even God!: For even if God is not constrained by such an inability, then indeed there is a frame of reference accessible at least to Him from which the absolute priority and locality of all events can be assessed accurately. But this *denies* the fundamental claim of relativity! Therefore, a believer in God *must* reject relativity, and a believer in relativity *must* reject God! These two *cannot ever* be conjoined! Obviously. Einstein consciously chose the second alternative; and in this, he chose to remain outside the Jewish faith, rejecting God as *the* Person, and *the* Spirit, and *the* Creator. But for the sake of relativity, he found himself to compromise even his own pantheistic “god”; who, identified with the universe, remains forever impotent of knowing even “himself”!

As you know, quantum mechanics is not any less but is in fact even more compromising of God, as Einstein himself realized and acknowledged even in regard to his own already compromised and circumscribed “god” of pantheism. We humans, in pursuit of trivia, may choose to gamble. But chance at the root of physical reality, as quantum theory teaches, is the denial of anything at all being possible to engineer (for engineering is a process of thinking and producing from which *every* element of chance is *completely* removed); as it also is the most absolute blasphemy against God that a bona fide scientist can utter: it would be patently inconsistent of us to recognize God such as to be worthy of our devotion and worship, if these mean anything at all, at the same time that we accept Him as the ultimate gambler, morally totally depraved, as uncaring for the outcome the game, when we to the extent that we are sane do not gamble at anything upon which at least our honor or our intelligence is dependent, and professional gamblers amongst us always try to maximize their probabilities of success and are *not at all* indifferent to them. Besides, even without reference to God, you will agree that it is a very curious game of chance indeed when chance rules at the basis of all things physical yet it alone and no other agency has “somehow” succeeded in establishing the Planck constant as the exact, absolute and universal measure according to which the very same game of chance is to be and is being played!!! Since we know of no game of chance presupposing no law of construction, such as already exists in the deck of cards or in the roulette table,

to say beyond all experience that chance alone produces the fixed rules of the game and not some mind, as we may only attest to, is sheer nonsense, culpable in the extreme when uttered by professors of science, who profess to say something that is not founded securely on experience!

How then can it be justified that scientists, specifically those believing practicingly in God, proceed from the assumption of infallibility of both these theories to develop a third one that will bridge them, even as the one is in essence a theory of a single continuous entity called the “field” that alone, it claims, exists, and the other a theory of a host of distinct discontinuous entities called “quanta”? Where Logic at first, second and even third sight recognizes the absolute incompatibility of divisibility and indivisibility and of oneness and multitude, how secure can our confidence in the mathematics be, if at a fourth sight and with extreme difficulty and obscurity it should somehow appear to “produce” a “union” of the two even Logically disparate theories?

I take it you will agree that faith in an illogical or impossible thing is not worth having. When Logic *and* faith in God in conjunction suggest that things *cannot* be as the two theories of the century suggest and indeed claim, despite their successes, a scientist who is also a believer in God *must* draw the line and *begin to doubt both those theories* and *not* his own Logic, because ultimately, it is only by his Logic that he must judge everything else, including his faith in God and his confidence in science. If you should happen to have determined otherwise, showing the unfoundedness of all these thoughts of mine, I would be very much obliged if you would care to enlighten me.

For my part, I have come to the realization that, the belief in the “inaccuracy” of Newton’s law of gravitation that “justified” the search for a “better” theory of gravitation rested solely on the tacit and pure *assumption* that the separation r between the two attracting masses is always [to be considered as] rectilinear. If the separation is not rectilinear, and it is doubtful that it is whenever even light moves curvilinearly [for in that case, even if we insist on a curvilinear path of separation, we possess absolutely no physical means of measuring the separation], then the force of gravity will be less than calculated on the assumption of the shorter rectilinear path, and the planet will precess. In other words, a law determining the proper separation r *is* objectively needed *before* Newton’s law can be applied, or even assessed as inaccurate! Logic then dictates that the correct application of the former law *saves* the latter from *all* inexactitude. Besides, the very small difference between Newton’s law, even as it is so far seen to apply, and the reality of things suggests that the latter will differ from the former in an *equally small* measure in all other consequential respects as well. What I here have in mind is that on the basis of Newton’s law it is found that G has the dimensions of $(\text{density})^{-1} \times (\text{time})^{-2}$ and thus it can be written exactly as $G = a/d \cdot t^2$,

where α is a numerical constant yet to be determined, while d represents density and t time. But then, since G is a universal quantity independent of the bodies to which the law applies, it must also follow that the quantities d and t are also universal quantities, independent of all bodies. Then it follows that d cannot be other than D the average density of matter in the Universe, and t no other than T the age of the Universe, so that $G = \alpha DT^2$. Then, since $D = M/V$, we find that $GMT^2 = \alpha V$, suggesting an *undoubtable expansion* of the Universe as a *direct consequence* of Newton's law of gravitation when G and M are both constant. In fact, it has been shown that the universe *cannot* be as we find it unless G and M are both constant. Then for $V = (4/3)\pi R^3$, the radius of the universe expands with velocity $dR/dT \approx T^{-1/3}$ that decelerates according to $d^2R/dT^2 \approx T^{-4/3}$, due solely to the field of gravity, $G = -GM/R^2$, from which it develops that $\alpha = 1/6\pi$, $R = [(9/2)GMT^2]^{1/3}$ and $dR/dT = [(4/3)GMT^{-1}]^{1/3} = c$, *the velocity of light*, for we here have introduced nothing other than the volume and the mass of the universe. Then for $T = 12 \times 10^9$ years, $M = 1.15 \times 10^{56}$ g, and $R = 1.70 \times 10^{28}$ cm, producing an average present density of matter 5×10^{-30} g/cm³. These results are all within one order of magnitude of the best astronomical estimates and subject to correction only if the age of the universe needs correcting. In other words, these findings, *sufficiently* by the power of the *very close* proximity of Newton's law to reality (even if the former is perceived as slightly inaccurate), *are themselves very close to reality!* This at a minimum! For when, through the law of separation, Newton's law is seen to be absolutely exact, the above findings too will be seen to be absolutely exact! The important things here are the variability of the velocity of light and the materiality of the photon—that it has mass. Obviously, *none* of these two findings is in jeopardy on account of the slight “inexactitude” of Newton's law, and they both are contrary to the teachings of modern science! It also develops that nothing other is needed for light to have the same velocity everywhere in the universe at the same time than that the deceleration of gravity be the same everywhere, which means that the local density of matter at a distance $r = \rho R$ from the center of the Universe is given by $d = (9\rho\pi GT^2)^{-1}$. Naturally, I do not have to tell you what all these mean for the status of current science, or as *physical proofs* of God's existence, given the inability of the Universe to institute these laws upon itself. It would be naive to say that all this could possibly have escaped the notice of God, if it could not escape the notice of [any] one of us [caring to apply a careful dimensional analysis to Newton's law]! Just as it would be totally discreditable to say that all this is pure coincidence!!! Some coincidence!!!

Then, of course, there is *the fact* that when we change only the orientation of the axes of the Michelson-Morley interferometer, we do *not* change the direction in which it moves as a whole in space, which, contrary to the *false* standing analysis, produces the *incontrovertible* result that the axes are *really* compressed

according to

$$\begin{aligned}R_x &= R(1 - \rho^2)(1 - \rho^2 \sin^2 \alpha)^{-1/2}; \\R_y &= R(1 - \rho^2)(1 - \rho^2 \sin^2 \beta)^{-1/2}; \\R_z &= R(1 - \rho^2)(1 - \rho^2 \sin^2 \gamma)^{-1/2};\end{aligned}$$

where x, y, z are the directions in space of a three-dimensional interferometer of which the Michelson-Morley instrument is the two-dimensional analogue, R is their common length when motionless in space, $\rho = v/R$ and α, β, γ the angles of the axes with the true direction of motion in space that, of course, are only constrained by $\cos^2 \alpha + \cos^2 \beta + \cos^2 \gamma = 1$. The above makes plain the general law of contraction of moving bodies, and the fact that *only* for $\alpha = 0^\circ, \beta = \gamma = 90^\circ$ is the Michelson result obtained as $R_x = R_y(1 - \rho^2)^{1/2}$! Therefore, special relativity loses its supposed formal support on the Michelson-Morley experiment! Besides, the above relationships demonstrate that *every body* in nature is intrinsically and instantaneously cognizant of the direction of its motion, which of course, means that there is indeed a “preferred” orientation for *every body* despite the relativity statement to the contrary.

On the other hand, the quantum theory got its start from the Rutherford atom and the Bohr model of the electron in the atom, and [was] developed on the inability of scientists then to come up with the correct physical model of the atom, in face of which it devolved into a probabilistic theory. But when that beginning is sufficiently demonstrated to have been wrong by the presentation of the correct fully physical model that shows how the same law gives rise to the spectra of all atoms as electrons are added to or removed from them, in complete detail and on a totally non-probabilistic scheme, can there then be any basis for continuing to teach the validity of the present theory? The numerical findings of the present theory do *not* come out naturally; rather, the parameters of the theory are adjusted until its findings agree with experiment! But is this a legitimate procedure when compared to the *physical* model that needs *no* such adjustment in order to produce the measured results? For the sake of not making this letter even longer, you will forgive me if I do not enter here into details.

In light of these findings, how justified are we then to continue to [seek] a “bridge” between relativity and the current quantum mechanics? There can be no question that these new findings involve none of the immense complexity of either relativity or quantum theory, and of course, none of the even greater complexity of the string theory. If, by comparison to the simpler case, relativity and quantum mechanics are not only false but also Goldbergian machines belonging only to museums of intellectual curiosities, how can we argue seriously that God employed an even more complicated [intellectual] contraption as a theory of the world, which He then proceeded to implement in Reality? And if God made, as

He would only make the world according to the *simplest* set of principles, do we do creditable science when we ignore and suppress the simpler route and attempt to reproduce the “same” numerical results by a far more complicated method? What I here also have in mind is the fact that general relativity claims to contain Newtonian gravitation. Yet, the above findings, that are the *direct* consequence of Newton’s fourth law, not only are they *not* reachable by relativity but stand in direct opposition to it. How creditable is then relativity for totally missing the physical and cosmological significance of Newton’s fourth law (that in reality is a *physical, yet not man-made law*), which it claims it contains? Or a yet more general theory that *also* fails to reach these results?

These are only some of the questions which, I trust, you will recognize, have special poignancy for a scientist believing in God. Such a scientist has *no* right to withhold the above findings or to suppress them. This would be an effrontery not merely against a fellow human but against God Himself, Who is thus left to be depicted as being unable to follow a more economical route to the same(?) objective and prevented from showing His Wisdom and His Power over the world, as amply demonstrated by the evidence of the above findings. One can understand an atheist suppressing these findings, for they undermine and expose his no longer objective, but *subjective and false* atheistic beliefs. But what justification can a believer have in doing so, when it is obvious that doing so is an act *fully consciously acted against* the Will of God??? You will now appreciate the full significance of the fact that physics, as the correct science of the world, is *not at all* man-made, but God’s way of telling us [how to] find Him out even through the study of His Creation—[that is] only [the *most secure*] form of TheoLogy!

I do not think that I here need say more.

Most sincerely,

AUTHOR’S COMMENT: Not even from this publicly self-proclaimed to believe in God scientist did I receive a response!

55

Re: APPEALING THE TRIAL OF SOCRATES

(Circa end of 1990)

In the history of Mankind, very few trials over issues of life and death have captivated, fascinated and mortified us generation after generation. Fewer still have, besides, truly altered the course of History. In the latter category, only one trial belongs: Christ's. In the former, one may confidently add another: Socrates'. Their differences *and* similarities are there for all to see; and one can hardly mention the one without recalling the other.

To the modern examiner, nothing is more puzzling than that they both were brought for *religious* differences made out to look like crimes for which only death was the appropriate punishment. But why are we today so puzzled? Is it because we have become so tolerant and so unbigoted that we fail to comprehend the "intolerance" and "bigotry" of those "past" generations? Or is it because, so exhausted from our differences and bloodletting, we so desperately try to cling to whatever, however superficial, empty and ephemeral, "will hold us together" that we forget what truly makes us "ἀνθρώπους"? Why today do religious matters leave us so cold and "uninterested"? Is there today, can there ever be, a truly irreligious person? What will take finally to convince us that *in the absence of proof or disproof* of the existence of God, *both belief in Him and unbelief in Him* (that is, *belief in the opposite*, in His nonexistence) *are, inescapably, equally religious activities*? And what will take finally to convince us that in the presence of proof of His existence, our rejection of Him can only be due to a conscious, though desperate and doomed, effort to pump up from the deep bottom of a well already dried up yet another, no longer existent, drop of life-sustaining "water", in order that we may "live" for yet another day a life without Him, now proven to exist, a "life" that bears all the characteristics of death apart from that of panicky pointless, totally purposeless motion that alone we call "life"?

No, I do *not* digress. We *cannot*, even as self-appointed judges, hear the appeal of those old trials in hopes of finally adjudicating them justly without settling in our souls the *eternal religious* questions! This must be the minimal test of fitness for an appeals judge. The "judge not, lest ye be judged" *has* been misunderstood. It does *not* mean that we should suspend all judgment for fear of ourselves being hauled to trial. That *is* in the "cards" at any rate! To judge and

be judged *are* in the nature of being “ἀνθρωπος”, *parts of our very definition!* It only means that we must *never rush* to judgment (that is to say, *not* just let the time go by unused as we occupy ourselves with other matters, but that we *not let every stone bearing on the case unturned* for fear that we may find underneath it something we hate to find existing!), for by that very act, so too we judge and condemn ourselves and open ourselves to a now certain accusation of and condemnation for committing injustice, all the more difficult and indeed impossible to disprove, for having committed it *supposedly* (as we fool ourselves) in the interests of justice. We may hide behind the “law” and all sorts of “precedent”, but the fact remains that *every* trial and *every* re-trial tries *not only the accused, but also the accusers, and the judge and the jury adjudicating both the original trial and the re-trial!* Even as we today sit to re-try a 2400-year-old trial, *our own present lights are being sat on trial!* And because judging is in the nature of being human, we cannot evade, no matter how desperately we try, passing judgment on ourselves. Even to decide not to judge, not to re-try is itself and in itself, a *complete judgment of ourselves*, as we judge it “unimportant” to re-examine those age-old issues, which the details of those trials only dressed up in the idioms of those times, without being able to alter even by one iota their internal *substance*.

So *re-try, and justly, we must!* And because we must, we must also understand the differences and similarities of those ages and ours. Even the differences and similarities of our linguistic terms that we have adopted straight out of *their* usage, that may sound “identical” (as we only fool ourselves into believing) with theirs but *are* worlds apart. Take the word “democracy” for one. Hardly anything gives so much pride today as to be self-acclaimed “democratic”, and so much anxiety lest we be suspected of undemocratic inclinations! To assuage that fear, even truth, even justice itself *are* being sacrificed on the altar of “democracy”! The Greeks, especially the Athenians, were proud of being the fathers of democracy. We today, have adopted the term in our effort to emulate them, in our effort to become Greeks and Athenians in spirit as Isocrates meant the terms. But do we succeed? The awful fact is that we do *not!* We do *not* become of their spirit simply by using the term “democracy” for our systems of governance. We must also be willing, as they were (and for the passage of so many years, *at least as they were*), to examine the success or failure of our in-name-only-same systems. We must once and for all understand that what we owe to the Greeks, we owe it *not* to such as Pericles and Alcibiades, but to Socrates and Plato.

The Athenians became democratic out of respect and gratitude and in memory eternal of their last king Kodros, who decided willingly to die, he alone, in battle, rather than see the Athenians conquered and Athens destroyed. He battled and died. And Athens and the Athenians were saved. Kodros was the last king, period, who ever did so! Since Kodros, to this day, kings, hereditary or ap-

pointed, for the sake of preserving themselves in power over their kingdoms have sent and are still sending to battle only their subjects, or their mercenaries, even if drawn only from amongst the poorest of their subjects. Today, we call them “professional army”, which means that “they”, for a pitiless salary, sacrifice limb and life for “us” to reap the fruits! Today, oblivious not only of the example of Kodros, but also of Solomon, we see the Emir of Kuwait calling for war (and financing its preparation) that will certainly destroy his emirate in order that he have it back, and in feigned worship of “democracy” (that in this case, nakedly means the crass profits of *some* of us) “we” are *both* instigating his expenditures *and* playing his mercenaries! All unKodrian kings have chosen to see their subjects dead and their kingdoms turned back to heaps of stones, rather than to see them live and prosper under somebody else, or some other system!

The Athenians became democratic also because they no longer wanted to have to send to battle and for their own benefit, somebody else; just as they would not hide behind the skirts of a woman, they would not hide behind the shield of another man: To them it was an equal ἀτιμία—the complete and final loss of honor. That was the Kodrian legacy. Today, in defense of our arteriosclerotic, ostensibly “civilized” old age (simply for the 2400 years that have passed since and what we have learned as subjects of empires), and for our *corrupt* “respect” for life, as we do not even have the minimal manly courage to admit that *it is only our own life, profit and luxury that we only care about*, and having devised an elaborate and cowardly pseudo-philosophy of “democracy” in order solely to cover up our shameful shamelessness, we do not hesitate to send to distant sands even our daughters, pretending all the while that we “love” them! So, honestly, we cannot even wash the feet of the Athenians, who honestly, reasonably and *freely* took upon themselves all the responsibilities of governance, including taxing themselves in proportion of what they possessed that needed defending, including also shedding their blood in times of peril.

We, today, see “democracy” as a “right” of the people, shamefully hiding from view our scheming to prevent from becoming clear to all that that “right” is only the skirt behind which the powerful are empowering themselves callously to exploit the weak of their fellow-citizens within our “democratic” systems, and at the same time to brainwash them into believing that they are the best governed citizens of the “greatest democracy” that ever existed! It takes mountains of scheming and conniving to succeed in such pandering! Yet, we have succeeded, all the while forgetting that other distinction that the Athenians never failed to draw: that between demagogues and true statesmen. Today, we call the former “great communicators” thus cunningly bypassing the problem of demagoguery! Our *savoir vivre* prevents us from calling to task even the demagogues! Today, we also fail to distinguish between sophists and true philosophers: We call them all and indiscriminately “professors”! That they all, almost to the man, have

given up examining from their secure chairs the eternal, the only truly philosophical, and have opted only for the fashionable, the cozy, the easy, the lazy, the profitable, the momentarily amusing, rather than the soul-consuming thought is of no concern! And because demagoguery and sophistry go together, we have given up trying to weed out even the sophists!

It is certainly not without the deepest consequences that today we no longer have even one philosophy to which we can point with some justifiable pride. It seems as though anything we touch professorially turns to ashes. So, the professors, first and perhaps alone in having tasted from within the bitterness of that experience, have given up believing in the truth of anything written down and come to us from ages past, just as they no longer believe in the truth even of their own writings. Lost in their labyrinthine illusions, they have decided that everything is relative, that nothing is therefore deserving of examination as possibly containing even a nugget of eternal truth. To the modern professorial sensitivities, the notion of eternity is most offensive. So, rather than receive and examine open-mindedly the ancient texts, they choose to regurgitate the vacuous writings of each other concerning those ancient texts, always deciding to leave on the side the *substance* of those ancient texts.

So, even the trial of Socrates has been judged as a political (in the ordinary sense of the word) trial, in which the democratic Athenians took their rather well justified though belated revenge on the apostle of at least the intellectual aristocracy, even as *not* of all aristocracy! Little has it mattered in the deliberations of the professors that no “aristocrat” has ever chosen, as Socrates had, to remain poor for life, in order to devote himself to molding, person-to-person and totally free of charge, as no professor today even dreams of doing, the character of his fellow-citizens in all matters pertinent to a full and purposeful life, in which even as great a portion of life as the Athenians had apportioned to the life of the πόλις, was nevertheless only a part of the total life, and life-long education of the soul. Pandering to the masses and totally neglectful of the soul, the professors have chosen to see in the *wise* Socratic emphasis on the *obviously desirable usage* τῆς ἀρίστων ἀρετῆς only what *they* suppose was *his sly undermining* of the democratic system, while conveniently forgetting Socrates’s life-long arduous effort to elevate *even the last* citizen, who would care to listen, to the level of the ἀρίστων, that is *not closed to anyone*! Clearly implicit in the Socratic view is the idea that *every citizen is in dire need of improving his soul*, an activity in which the leaders then, as now, were, not inoften, even less proficient than the led. But no professor today believes in the souls enough to find the courage to say so! So, essentially, all professors are today reduced to pandering, because those for whom they really work take a very dim view of the nightmare of waking up to having to address a *correctly educated* citizenry such as Socrates labored to develop. So, was he really an aristocratic anti-democrat, or, rather, a true lover of

Democracy, never hesitating even unto death (as his Defense clearly shows by his exemplary refusal and even disdain to invoke the mercy of his judges, as does also his subsequent refusal to escape from prison) to sacrifice an entire life in order that he make *an aristocrat of the soul out of every citizen of Athens?*

To understand the magnitude of the Socratic stance, we only need to recall that, later, Aristotle, when also threatened with prosecution, chose to flee Athens, and two thousand years later, Galileo gave in rather than die. So, it is fully understandable that the professors, closer at heart to Aristotle and Galileo, dislike and even hate Socrates for having set that shaming all that do not follow it example! But who of the professorially acclaimed democrats has wished for more for his fellow citizens, or sacrificed more? The professors, for their pandering, cunningly refuse to think straight! And in their cunning, they apportion, rightfully they claim, equal blame for that travesty of Justice to both Socrates and the Athenians! "Democracy" shall not be found wanting! Least of all in our own times, when it really needs the most severe paddling on the behind! And in order to accommodate that finding and the softies who today pass for "democrats", Socrates shall be found to have been lesser than he truly was! To that effect, everything written down about Socrates must be "decoded", the good professors believe, for the "truth" to surface. That in the process the "good" professors reduce even the great Plato to shameful, purposeful lying about everything he ever wrote, without leaving us the secret code by which we might today "decode" his writings to "learn the truth", as the professors now judge it to be, is of no concern of theirs! What in their cunning the "good" professors miss totally is that in judging Socrates and Plato, they are caught to be judging by their own dim lights! I. F. Stone has recently not hesitated to accuse Plato even of callous insensitivity for depicting Xanthippe as having greater concern for Socrates' friends' impending loss rather than her own imminent bereavement! And the "good" professors nod "thoughtfully" their approval! They find it impossible to see in Xanthippe the great woman behind the great man, choosing to focus on her "nagging" and on Socrates' own "neglect" of his own family. That that "nagging" and that "neglect" Socrates named as they would appear to those outside the family and that they carried *none* of the onerous connotation on the conjugal level but were perhaps even terms of endearment between husband and wife, the "good" professors have neither the imagination, nor the humor, nor the rigorous logic to see for themselves! That with his closing words in his Apology, Socrates leaves a blessing and a curse, as conscientious Greek parents still do, on his own still young children and calls on the entire πόλις of Athens to witness that bequest, lest his own children ever prove unworthy of their father as teacher of proper behavior, an act that would be entirely incomprehensible to any father truly neglectful of his own children, let alone also of a philosopher-father, the "good" professors (in their blind servile obedience to Freud, that so-

called “shining light” of our century for “discovering” the supposed eternal enmity of father and son, that is truly alien to any proper family and even more so to the Greeks who always taught their children to surpass them) also choose to ignore. The fact that *to this day* Greek widows, even in front of their husbands’ coffins, also lament the loss of them to their friends rather than only their own far greater loss of their life-long companions, which only intones the greater loss by not neglecting the lesser, all the while giving the emphasis to the loss itself and *not* to whose it is greater or lesser, that this fact remains beyond the grasp of professors claiming expertise on the ageless Greek Spirit but only managing thereby to show how little they have studied or understood the Greeks, is only just another proof of their true scholarship!

So too it must be entirely beyond them that the trial of Socrates was a *religious* trial, not a “political” one, even as it was brought by and adjudicated by neither religious bigots nor ignoramuses of religion suddenly turned intolerant of another man’s religion and God. But the Athenians then, more than anyone else then or since, understood that religion is a *total* activity and colors *all* other activities! What they did not then like was the intensity of that color. They had already been educated by the great poets, the great tragedians, even the great comedians. The years of Aristophanean comedy were also the years of tragic, disastrous, fratricidal war. Moral laxity is palpable when people do not know whether or not they will be alive tomorrow. Even after the coming of Christianity, on the eve of battle, soldiers do not suddenly become monks from on their knees contemplating their sins; they rather turn even more prodigal. The American soldiers in Vietnam, faced with an impossible situation, “amused” themselves, though by no means all of them, with drugs or in the brothels of Saigon. Today, the American government has seen it “fit” to rent a luxurious ocean liner for the “diversion” of the soldiers sent to “defend” sands where prostitution, to our own shame, is unknown! Keen observers as they were of the world, and having seen it all before, the judges of Socrates could certainly not have been shocked by his alleged introduction of “new” gods and “corruption” of the young! In his trial Socrates challenged the fathers among his judges *and the audience*, the fathers of *all* Athens, of the allegedly “corrupted” youth to step forward and give witness to that alleged crime. *Not one* stepped forward! So, the alleged “corruption” was *not*, as the homosexuals, the sly haters of the Socratic example and the sundry “defenders” of “democracy” have for 2400 years left it to be implied a corruption of the body, or of the soul through the introduction of some unknown-before-now-at-the-trial-proven-dangerous “new” gods (Socrates did *not* appeal to any other God than Apollo the God of Light, respected by the *entire* world for being just that!), but rather, only an admonition and awakening of the young to care for their souls and not to repeat the follies of their fathers who caused the destruction of Athens! It goes without saying that a recalcitrant,

ossified old regime, responsible for the destruction of a state, will accuse anyone pointing to their own sins with the very sins they in their hearts know all too well they have committed! The Athenians did not prove themselves above this rule! “Democracy” and demagoguery brought on the war and the destruction. And those who believe in the “democracy” of the citizen *as is*, not as Socrates wanted to see him become, have nowhere to turn but to more demagogues promising more false miracles, rather than to physicians ordering bitter medicines for the soul. The latter *are* “dangerous”! Nothing short of their elimination can save “democracy” *as is*! The Athenians were not irreligious, nor intolerant, nor bigoted. But seen from the religious-philosophical point of view, they were no better than ignorant youths, very much like us today who think we discharge our religious duties by attending mass, for at most an hour a week while never bothering to inform all week and all our lives of the grave cosmological-philosophical-political-social-religious-moral, i.e., *total* significance of our belief in God. A *thorough* philosopher *cannot* evade the *total* question! By his standing, Socrates before, during and after his trial *showed* that he was a *thorough* philosopher, to whom nothing, not even life itself matters more than the significance of the *total, absolute consistency of faith* in God, which not even “Christianity” has yet understood so *completely failing* to comprehend the *deep* meaning of “thou shall love thy God with ... and *all thy intellect*”! This, the Athenians, always too thin-skinned to miss it, understood all too well! What they were not prepared to accept was the concomitant question of full responsibility for their acts, past, present and future, that the Socratic teaching of *total* obedience to God clearly called for! Socrates finally succeeded in becoming the thundering voice of the conscience, the perfectly undistorted mirror of their distorted souls. Nobody likes either that voice or that spectacle. And under the tutelage of demagogues and sophists, and neglectful of Reason, they decided to silence the voice, to break the mirror! It was only *after* his death that the Athenians finally understood what Socrates by word and deed was telling them. It was then that they meted out their punishment to his accusers for misguiding the Demos.

And thus it was that by his *total* example of life and death has Socrates deservedly been recognized *not* as a martyr for “learning”, or “education” of “philosophy” or “free speech”, for these *are all false* recognitions, but truly as the first pre-Christian Christian of the Greek world (which the still Asiatic in spirit “Christians” choose to ignore), in the exact same sense that the prophets of the Old Testament were martyrs of and for Christ. Without Socrates, the *complete* sense of Logos, the very fountainhead of Reason, in other words God Himself becoming finally incarnate amongst us as Christ could not possibly have been seen as utterly Logical as only a thorough Greek Orthodox Christian can possibly *truly know*! The Hebraic path to Christ was solely by faith in the witness of God’s miracles among men. And that faith ultimately failed the vast majority of

Hebrews who remained Jews, as it later failed those Christians also who remain “Christian” only in name. Because, the miracles must be seen as a *transient* phase in the religious development of Man. The truly religious person does *not* need miracles in order to believe: *Reason* alone suffices! The Hebrews could produce only faith, not Reason, and that faith finally abandoned them as they refused to face the significance of the fact that they neither could explain the miracles of the Old Testament and of Christ in person by means of this world, nor could they present evidence of Christ’s own sinfulness, as Christ also challenged them to do, exactly as Socrates had earlier challenged the Athenians. It is for this reason, for their not informing their faith with Reason that Christ has remained for the Jews the Stumbling Block. The Hellenic path, leading on from Socrates to Christ logical step upon logical step, because it was pegged *not* on faith in the miracle, but on faith in the Logos as the fountainhead of all Logic and of everything Good that exists in the world, was for that very reason far more successful, which explains why it was the Greeks and the Greeks in Spirit who became the champions of the New Faith. You *can* take the faith in the miracle out of the man, but you *cannot* take out of him, once firmly implanted, the faith in the Logos; certainly not as the Greeks understand the term. And this we owe to Socrates.

But we need not have the hindsight of twenty Creek-Christian centuries to find him innocent of all charges against him. He is being exonerated even by his own demand that our polity, i.e., our total behavior as citizens be fully consistent with our faith in Reason. Perhaps, slow learners that we truly are, we needed the experience even of his death to realize his own total commitment to that ideal. Before his death, the Athenians chose to be inconsistent, for which they deserved to be shamed by the lesson of his death. This is why neither religion can be taken out of the trial of Socrates, nor Socrates out of the proper understanding of Religion. “Democracy” that darling of the demagogues all over the world, *is* dangerous! It makes men forgetful of their own responsibility for *every* vote they cast, which is paid in sweat and tears and even blood both at home and around the globe. The demagogues of Athens took their revenge on Socrates. Those in Jerusalem on Christ Himself. But on both occasions, *it was the misled, yet not entirely ignorant, and thus not innocent people* who, by casting their condemning votes, or in the case of Christ their ochlocratic screams for blood, became the *true executioners and perpetrators* of the two greatest judicial crimes ever! Shall we ever learn???

56

**Re: THE STATE OF DEMOCRACY AND
THE CITIZEN'S RESPONSIBILITY**

Editor-in-Chief
KATHEMERINE
Socratous 57
Athens 10431

October 19, 1992.

Dear Sir:

I am writing to express my deepest disappointment with the intolerable state of the country, about which, *every* single citizen, to the extent that he is a citizen of a democracy, must consider himself personally responsible. Even ignoring the other branches of government, the press, as the so-called fourth estate, is by no means less responsible. I am altogether flabbergasted by the fact that there seems to be no Greek in any position of responsibility who has sat back to consider the picture of the country from an outsider's perspective. This, at the very moment that the country faces tremendous problems vis à vis the foreign countries with which she must deal. Let me tell you this: Whether the Greeks like it or not, Greece's foreign friends are **very** tired with her **inability** to observe her international obligations as a modern country. For the good of the country, this situation *must change, fast*, if you know what is good for you. I am altogether amazed that the leaders of this country have the face to sit at the international tables totally unprepared to discuss the matters at hand in a responsible and binding manner. Let me tell you this also: Whether you like it or not, out there, dog eats dog, and nobody truly likes a constant and determined underdog, who seems to like remaining in that state and receiving blows, while only whimpering, whining and complaining. *Every* single country has her own problems, and for solving them, she is prepared to do all she can. By contrast, Greece is *not*! Let me assure you that in the international arena, there are **no** friends, **only** interests; no sentimentality, only naked practicality, and each is expected to contribute first, and only then to demand! The Greeks, if they truly want to see better days and be respected by others, must at last learn to play the game, with *panache*! And the first rule of the game is that **they prove they respect themselves, by keeping their word** in the international field. As things stand, **the word of this country is not worth the paper it is written on**. You may not like

it; but this is the fact **as others see it**. It is no good trying, *for domestic consumption*, to plead with foreign politicians to issue words of approval behind which **the utterly incompetent political and diplomatic leaders** of this country may find refuge. (For that matter, things of the greatest significance lose their true value in translation, especially when they are deliberately mistranslated, only in order to put to sleep the ignorant domestic market of rotten political canned food. Even you yourselves do not seem to have any real idea of how foreign institutions and governments work! E.g., you have repeatedly represented in your newspaper the US Internal Revenue Service as Police! It is the Government branch, under the Department of the Treasury, that has the duty to collect, and **all** the power needed for collecting, the Federal Revenue, i.e., **all** the monies that by Law belong to the US Government. Do understand at last the **full** meaning of these words, but *not* for goodness sake after translation in Greek and as seen from the perspective of the Greek domestic experience! In the US *nobody* plays with the IRS!) If you are truly serious about improving the state of affairs in this country, stop circulating cash money in the huge quantities that are now in the hands of citizens. In the law-abiding civilized world, honest citizens do *not* carry so much cash as do even relatively poor Greeks. Only the types of the underworld do, who have the serious problem of “washing”, i.e., legalizing it! Force payment by cheques of all accounts above, say, 10000drs., forbid payments, even by banks, of cash in amounts greater than 25000drs/day and pass a law to the effect that **all credits and all debits in all accounts** be reported to the Greek IRS. The honest citizen has *absolutely* nothing to fear, only the crook. Anyone who shall be stupid enough to declare himself against such a measure, shall have shown himself to be a *crook*, and no law may protect him in his crookedness! When the Greek citizen learns to pay his taxes, he will find his country to have profited immeasurably in international respect. Are **you** prepared to propose this measure? And to insist on it? To get truly angry with every crook in Government or out of it who shall be foolish enough to oppose it?

You seem to decry the latest fiasco of the two main political leaders of this country. By *all* international standards, they **are incompetent** for their duties. As they say abroad, they have managed to promote themselves to a level where **their utter incompetence shows all too clearly!** Are **you** prepared to call the kings naked? Is by its constitution this country delivered to crooks and incompetents? If so, **do** change the constitution! If not, **kick them in their ass!** True, the country *cannot* afford interminable elections of incompetent people! **Abolish the parties! Separate** the legislative and executive branches of government! As things stand in this country, the laws are written by people *unable* to write a modern law, giving *themselves* the sole right to interpret them (by ministerial decision!) and enforcing them on their enemies and the hapless populace, but never on themselves! It is unconscionable that this country should have so many

scores of government ministers, who, clearly, are not even competent to keep the streets and sidewalks clean and in good repair! Make the Ministry of Justice an *altogether independent agency of government, subject only to the Supreme Court*, and give them the power to indict even ministers, prime ministers, presidents for incompetence and dereliction of duty! Then you shall see if a wind of fresh air does not blow in this country! As things are now, where are the public attorneys? How do they protect the taxpaying citizen? **Athens has become the dirtiest place on earth, but no Greek seems the least ashamed!** Only the Parthenon is not yet buried in trash and excrement, and this only because it stands high and is not in the *immediate* discretion of the modern Greek, the most barbarous of all barbarians of history! If the Greek politicians are not ashamed of this condition, why do the Greek public attorneys not apply the law against them? Why do they permit the mayors of Athens to have abandoned the city to the discretion of the most uncivilized people living on earth today? Is there **one** public place in the city where one can be glad for having met the current standards of civilization? How do you have the cheek to expect others to respect you, when the Greeks do not respect the sacred soil upon which they almost defecate and certainly urinate in public? Is there no shame left in this country? Walk the streets, go around the public places and neighborhoods and tell me if the dirt, trash and the unspeakable indignity that is called public life does not bring utter shame to your heart, and together with it boiling anger. Go to *any* public hospital and tell me if their toilets belong in Europe!

You have managed to destroy the Greek language, even to the extent that high public servants are no longer capable of speaking proper Greek, and you have the cheek to demand of others to respect you? Do you realize that in foreign universities *better* Greek is taught and spoken than is by Greek ministers of state? When these people represent *such* a country abroad, how do you think they feel, or are truly being treated?

On the matter of Slav “Macedonia”, for being **incompetent**, *all* past Greek governments *never* protested the appellation, when that country was part of a united Yugoslavia. Now that things have changed and the Greeks are **again** caught with their pants down, has any responsible Greek agency, Government or other, *proposed* a name for that geographical entity? If not, why not? Why is the Greek Government and *all* Greek media of communications at such infuriatingly utter loss to refer to that entity by a legitimate name that can stand the international scrutiny? Are you gentlemen of the Greek Government and Press really such utter imbeciles? Let me propose to you three such names:

(a) In his “*History of Greece*”, J.B. Bury (Macmillan, London 1959) refers to that geographical entity by the name **Paeonia** (Παλονία). In Alexander’s times, its inhabitants were giving him trouble until he crushed them. I do **not** advocate you do the same thing! You simply do *not* have the wherewithal, **nor** the

international support, so please, for your own sake, **forget** Alexander's solution! (Your incompetence was shown years ago, in Cyprus! Only for the machinations of Athens, is Cyprus today a divided country! You still talk about that problem, but only manage to show your continuing incompetence on that and all other matters of present issue! Even as they stand with half their country, the Greek-Cypriots *are a happier* people than the Greeks of the mainland—if the latter *knew* their condition and what constitutes *true* happiness! Don't misunderstand me: I do *not* advocate the status quo in Cyprus! But Greece does *not* help them; she cannot help herself!).

(b) In his "*History of Rome*", M. Cary (Macmillan, London 1962) refers to Slav "Macedonia" and Southern Serbia by the name **Upper Moesia** (Ἀνω Μοισία). That, together with a narrow strip of land, called Lower Moesia, and extending eastward to the Euxine, covering what today is Northern Bulgaria, constituted in Augustus Caesar's time the Province of Moesia, entirely distinct from the Province of Macedonia that was a *Greek* land.

The Government of Skoplje and all foreign Governments must be presented with the above options. Of the two, the first is *more* ancient and *altogether* specific. If there should still be any resistance, the Greek Government must investigate the International Law of Patents and Copyrights. Have they done so? If not, **why not**? Are they such idiots as not to use **all** international legal venues to protect this country? Will **you** let them remain inert?

(c) As a last compromise of my own devising, and if the Greek Government knows how to play international poker, *which they should play last*, how about the name **Slavodonia**? It rimes with Caledonia. There should be as much fear of confusing Macedonia with Slavodonia and there is of confusing either with Scotland! For that matter, word endings are *not* registrable! At last the Greeks must show some constructive initiative on the matter, stop being always obstructionist and reactionary and take it off the hands of foreigners who truly cannot care less, having more pressing problems of their own, from which Greece cannot much longer be permitted to distract them. The Greek Government must show that this country is determined to recognize **instantly** that geographical entity by **any** one of these three names that met with international approval. If Παλονία be chosen, Greece *must quietly stop using the name "Macedonia"* for lands that in ancient times were not Greek! The EC *can* here and now use any legitimate historical name she chooses. They can also **impose** it by using it *exclusively in all their diplomatic discussions and in the press, and by asking other powers around the world to do the same. (After all, it does not matter much how a country calls herself in **her** own language, but only how she is called internationally. Will at last everyone understand that the word Macedonia is only Greek and not Slavonic?)*. They have not done so, *only because the Greek representatives have failed to show the slightest initiative*, but only so

much imbecility that they deserve to be flogged publicly for dishonoring the country!

Perhaps, since you have bastardized so much the Greek language that you do not seem able to pass any responsible meaning through it, you will appreciate the language of the present letter, that at least has the advantage of not mincing words.

Sir: Let us see if you have the political courage to print this letter *as is*, in English, together with an *honest* Greek translation.

As for me, wanting *neither honor nor wrath*, and having already made enemies right and left for telling the naked truth, please, permit me to sign this letter by the pseudonym:

Returning Philhellene.

P.S. Because by so signing I appear to challenge you to show such courage as I myself do not exhibit, please consider the terrible position of a foreigner loving this country but furious at its inhabitants for what they do to her! Also, whether what I say here is for good or ill!: For my being a foreigner, it is much better for *everyone* that I not give you my name!

ANSWER: Naturally, I expected none! But I *did* expect that the prime newspaper in the land would *not* avoid to make it its constant policy to stress all points referred to in this letter that *would* restore the dignity that is so much missing as it is so much needed in the domestic and international affairs of every Greek official and citizen!

57

**Re: ΤΑΓΩΝ ΑΣΩΤΕΙΑ
ΚΑΙ Η ΟΡΙΣΤΙΚΗ ΑΥΤΗΣ ΑΡΣΙΣ**

KATHEMERINE
Socratous 57
Athens 10431

1 Φεβρουαρίου 1993.

Κύριε Ἀρχισυντάκτα:

Ἵνα μὴ οἱ παμπόνηροι πλὴν ἡλίθιοι ταγοὶ τούτου τοῦ δυστυχοῦς τόπου προστιθέασι ταῖς ἀναριθμήτοις αὐτῶν ἀθλιότησι καὶ ἡλιθιότησι μίαν εἰσ-
έτι, ἐπιτραπήτω μοι σημειῶσαι διὰ τῶν στηλῶν ὑμῶν τὰ ἐξῆς συναφὴ δύο·

(α) Ἐνῷ σχεδιάζεται ὁ ἐκσυγχρονισμὸς καὶ ἐνίσχυσις τοῦ Πολεμ. Ναυ-
τικοῦ πρὸς προστασίαν τοῦ Αἰγαίου καὶ Νήσων, τὸ Ἐμπορ. Ναυτικὸν ἀδυ-
νατεῖ ὥς καὶ λόγῳ *μικρᾶς ἔτι κακοκαιρίας* πλεῦσαι τὰς ἑλλην. θαλάσσας,
ἐνῷ συγχρόνως κλείουσι καὶ τὰ ἐλλειπέστατα τῶν Νήσων ἀεροδρόμια ὥστ'
ἀποκόπτεσθ' ἐπικοινωνίας ζωτικοὶ ἑλλην. χώροι. Ἀντιλαμβάνεσθε τὰς *ἐν*
καιρῷ πολέμου σινεπείας τῆς καταστάσεως ταύτης. Ὡς ἡλιθίους ἐκλαμβά-
νουσιν οἱ ταγοὶ τούτου τοῦ τόπου τοὺς Τούρκους; Διατί ἐπέτρεψε καὶ ἐπι-
τρέπει τὸ ἑλλην. κράτος τὴν διατήρησιν αὐτῆς τῆς *προδοτικῆς* καταστάσε-
ως; Πότ' ἐπὶ τέλους ἀποκτήσομεν πλοῖα *ἱκανὰ ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ πλέειν*;

(β) Φέρετε τὸν κ. Στ. Κουλουκουντήν παρομοιάζοντα τὴν ὑπὸ τὸν νέον
αὐστηρότατον Ἀμερ. νόμον πλεῦσιν δεξαμενοπλοίων εἰς ΗΠΑ πρὸς ρωσσι-
κὴν ρουλέτταν. Ἐν τούτοις αἱ ΗΠΑ *οὐδ' ἐστερήθησαν οὐδὲ στερηθῶσιν* εἰσ-
αγωγῶν! Ὅπερ ἀποδείκνυσι τὰς δηλώσεις τοῦ κ. Κουλουκουντῆ ἀντανაკλώ-
σας μόνον τὸ κρατοῦν ἑλλην. ἐφοπλιστικὸν πνεῦμα, ὥστε καθελκύονται
πλοῖα ὑποδεέστερα καὶ τῶν σημερινῶν, καὶ τῶν αὐριανῶν, ἀπαιτήσεων!

Τόσον τὸ ἑλλην. κράτος διέφθιρε τὸν πολίτην ὥστε μὴ γένηταί *τι ἄξι-*
ον ὑπερηφανείας εἰς τοῦτον τὸν τόπον! Δι' ὃ, πάντες ἀπὸ τοῦ πολιτικοῦ καὶ
τοῦ ἐφοπλιστοῦ ἕως τοῦ κηφήνος τῶν δημ. γραφείων, ἐπιδιώκουσι τὸ εὐκο-
λον κέρδος ἔναντι *ἡσσοῦς ἢ μηδενικῆς* προσπάθειας. Καὶ τὸ κράτος ἐπι-
τρέπει καὶ διορίζει ἀνευθυβριαστως. Ἡ κατασκευὴ, λοιπόν, ἔργων ποιότητος
εἰς τοῦτον τὸν τόπον στοιχίσει *μόνον* τὴν ἐπὶ πλεον δαπάνην τῶν ὑλικῶν
(ὧν ἡ προμήθεια κυρίως ἐκ τῆς ἐσωτ. ἀγορᾶς διὰ πόρων ΕΟΚ τονώσκει τὴν
ἀγορὰν καὶ τὴν ἰδιωτ. δραστηριότητα), *εἰάν γε τὸ κράτος μεταφέρῃ ὑπο-*
χρεωτικῶς εἰς τὰ ἐργοτάξια τοὺς ἀναριθμήτους τῶν γραφείων κηφήνας
καὶ ἀναγκάσῃ αὐτοὺς παραδιδόναι ἔργα ποιότητος! Ἐὰν οὗτοι οὐκ ἐργα-
σθῶσι *πρῶτον ἐκεῖ, συντόμως ἐξ ἰδίας ὑπαιτιότητος*, οὐ σχήσουσιν εἴτε χώ-
ραν εἴτε γραφεῖον!

Ἡ Ἑλλάς, ὡς πάντες ἀνὰ τὸν κόσμον γνωρίζουσιν, οὐκ ἔστι πλέον χώρα πτωχή. Ἐγένετο χώρα πλουσία ἀλλ' ἄφρων καὶ ἄσωτος! Οἱ ταγοὶ αὐτῆς ἀσωτεύουσι πρῶτοι, διαφθείροντες τοὺς λοιπούς. Τὸ εἶναι τις πρῶτος με-
ταξὺ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἦν ποθ' ἡ ὑψίστη τιμή. Ὅθ' οἱ ταγοὶ μετέτρεψαν εἰς
Καφρίαν τὸν τόπον, ἑαυτοὺς πρῶτους εἰς Κάφρους μετέτρεψαν! Ὅπερ ἀπο-
τελεῖ καταισχύνην. Ἐπέστι πλέον ὁ καιρὸς δημοσίας συζητήσεως σοβαρᾶς
περὶ τοῦ πῶς ὁ τόπος ἀπαλλαγέσεται πάσης διαφθορᾶς, τῆς ἀρχῆς κατὰ
ταῦτ' ἀνωθεν ἀναγκαίως γενησομένης! ΟΥΚ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΕΛΛΗΝ ΠΑΣ ΠΕΡΙ
ΤΗΝ ΓΕΝΙΚΗΝ ΑΣΩΤΕΙΑΝ ΤΟΥ ΤΟΠΟΥ ΜΗ ΕΝΤΡΕΠΟΜΕΝΟΣ!

Μετὰ πάσης δικαίας τιμῆς,

51

Re: ΘΡΗΝΟΣ
ΕΠΑΝΑΚΑΜΨΑΝΤΟΣ ΕΙΣ ΕΛΛΑΔΑ

Κον Ἰωάννην Μαρίνον
Ἐφημερίδα: ΤΟ ΒΗΜΑ
Ἀθήνας, 10237

28 Ὀκτωβρίου 1993.

Ἀγαπητὲ Κύριε:

Παρακαλῶ δέξασθε τὴν παρούσαν (ἀρχικῶς συνταγείσαν εἰς ἀτονικὰ fonts, ἃ μόνον τότε εἶχον, καὶ διὰ τὸν λόγον αὐτὸν εἰς ἀπαράδεκτα μεικτὰ ἑλληνικά, ἃ ἐν τῷ παρόντι χάριν ἀκριβείας τοῦ λόγου ἀναμφιβόλως γενήσονται βέλτεια). Ἐὰν οὐ γράψω ὑμῖν, ἀσφαλῶς ἐκ θλίψεως ἐκραγήσοιμ' ἀδυνατιῶν ἐκφράσ' ἄλλως πως σκέψεις συντριπτικὰς ἐμοῦ γε αὐτοῦ πρὸς τιν' ἔχοντα τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ δημοσίως ἐκφράζεσθαι, μήπως φανῶσι αὐταὶ χρῆσιμ' εἰς τοῦτον τὸν τόπον, ὅπου ἀνάγκη ἐπιβάλλει μοι νῦν διαμένειν. Παρακαλῶ, μὴ προσμετρήτε με μεταξὺ τῶν σημερινῶν "Ελλήνων", ὥς οὐκ εἰμι "Ἕλληνα" πολίτης. Προσμετρήσατέ με ὅμως μεταξὺ τῶν κατὰ τὰ φαινόμενα ἐλαχίστων πλέον φορολογουμένων τούτου τοῦ τόπου, *ὑπερηφάνως* καταβαλλόντων τοὺς φόρους αὐτῶν εἰς ἀκέραιον, καὶ *μόνων αὐτῶν οὕτω δικαιουμένων τοῦ δέοντος σεβασμοῦ* ἀπὸ μέρους τῶν τοῦ τόπου ὑπηρετῶν καὶ παντὸς ἐτέρου χρήσιν ποιούντος τῶν φόρων, οὓς πάντας μόνοι αὐτοὶ διὰ τῶν φόρων ὑποβαστάζουσιν. Ἡ ἐλληνικότης τοῦ ὀνοματός μου πλέον τῆς ὑπερηφανείας τοῦ βάρους τῆς κληρονομίας ὃ καλοῦμαι βαστάζειν, προκαλεῖ μοι καὶ *ἐντροπὴν βαθυτάτην!* Διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ οὓς θεωρῶ πνευματικούς προγόνους τιμὴν, ἀναγκάζομαι συμμερίζεσθαι ὄνομα οὗ ἕνεκα τὰ μέγιστα ὑπέστην ἐν ξένοις, ὅλως ἀναιτίως προσωπικῶς, διὰ τὰς ἀναριθμήτους ἀναισχυντίας τῶν νέων "Ελλήνων", ἀθελήτως ἀλλ' αὐτομάτως ὑπονοουμένων ἐκεῖ κατὰ σύγκρισιν πάσης καθημερινῆς πράξεως πολιτῶν καὶ ὀργανωμένης κοινωνίας, ἣ καὶ ἀναφερομένων κατὰ πᾶσαν σχετικὴν συζήτησιν, οὐχὶ ἐξ ἀγενείας ἀλλ' ἀνάγκης τοῦ βίου καὶ λόγου, κατὰ προσώπου παντὸς φέροντος ἑλληνικὸν ὄνομα. Ἀλλ' εἰσὶν αὐτὰ ἐμπειρίαι καὶ αἰσθήματα ἃ οὐδεὶς τῶν ἐδῶ κατοικούντων (καὶ μόνον ὡς *ξένος*, οὐχὶ ὡς ἴδιος ἄλλου τινὸς τόπου, καὶ διὰ μόνην τὴν ἀναψυχὴν ἐν πολιτισμῷ, ἣ μόνην τὴν ἐν τάχει προσαπόκτησιν ξένου τινὸς τίτλου ἵνα εἴτα "λάμψη" ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ χώρᾳ ἐπισκεπτόμενος ξένην γῆν, οὐχὶ *χάριν ἀληθοῦς καὶ πλήρους μορφώσεως γνώσεως καὶ χαρακτῆρος* καὶ μακροχρονίου πνευματικῆς δημιουργίας ἐγκαθιστάμενος καὶ ζῶν ἐν τῇ ξένῃ) "Ελλήνων" (ὡς φαιδρῶς καὶ ἐν ἄκρως ἐξορ-

γιστική επιπολαιότητα αντιλαμβάνονται σήμερα οὔτοι τὴν ἔννοιαν τοῦ ὅρου "Ἕλλην", ὃς οὐ μεταβιβάζεται διὰ τῆς γεννήσεως ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς μάστι-στα ἐπιπόνου αὐτοπαιδεύσεως) ἀντιμεμετώπικε ἢ ποτ' ἤσθηται, ἀνευθυρία-στος καταχρώμενος τοῦ ὀνόματος ἄλλων, οὓς πρὸς μὲν τὸ ἴδιον συμφέρον καὶ ἑαυτὸν μόνον ἀπατῶν φέρεται θεωρῶν προγόνους οὓς ἐν τούτοις οὐ-δόλως κατὰ πνεῦμα καὶ πρᾶξιν τιμᾶ, πρὸς δὲ τὰ ἐκ τοῦ ὀνόματος ἀπορρέ-οντα χρέη ἀποδείκνυσιν ἑαυτὸν ἀδιάντροπον καταχραστήν. Ἐάν, ὅπερ ὅλως ἀπέυχομαι, ταῦτα ἤδη θίγῃ καὶ ὑμᾶς, τόσον ὥστε πράξῃτε κατὰ τὸ εὐθι-κτον καὶ ὅλως ἀδικαιολόγητον "ἐλληνικὸν" θυμικόν (τὸ παρ' ἡμῖν γνωστὸν ὡς "φιλότιμον", μολονότι ἄκρως ἀφιλότιμον ἔστι!) μάλλον ἢ κατὰ τὸ παρ' "Ἕλλησιν" ἀνύπαρκτον πλέον λογικόν, ἐγὼ μὲν ἀπόλλυμι πολυτιμότεον χρόνον μετὰ πολλοῦ κόπου γράφων τὸ παρὸν παραμερίζων ἄλλα καὶ σπου-δαιότερα πνευματικὰ χρέη, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἀποδείξετε ἑαυτὸν ὡς ἓνα ἔτι τῶν ἐδῶ ὑπευθύνων, καὶ τὸ αὐτῶν ἥδη καταγελλόμενον ἀνευθυρίαστον! Προχωρῶ ἐπὶ τῇ ἐλπίδι ὅτι ὡς φαίνεσθε καὶ ἐστέ, ὅτι οὐ συγκαταλέγετε ἑαυτὸν μετὰ τῶν ἀσυγνώστως "εὐθίκτων", καὶ ὅτι χάριν τοῦ τόπου καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ πλέον ὅλως ἀπείρων τῶν ὄντως ἐκπολιτιζουσῶν ἐμπειριῶν, οὐκ ἀπο-δείξετε με ἀνόητον γράφοντα τὸ παρὸν παρὰ πᾶσαν ἐλπίδα!

Κατ' ἀρχὴν ὡς πρὸς τὸν *τόνον* τῶν ὡς ἄνω: *Πρέπει* χάριν τοῦ τόπου, διὰ παντὸς ἐγκαταλείπειν *πάντα ἀμβλὺν καὶ οὐχὶ εὐθὺν* λόγον!" Ἔστι τόση πλέον ἢ παχυδερμία ἀναγνωστῶν καὶ ἀκροατῶν ὥστε *πᾶσαν ἐτέραν* χρῆσιν τοῦ λόγου ἀποτελεῖν *ἀσύγνωστον ὡς ἠθελημένην* ἀπώλειαν χρόνου καὶ κό-που πνευματικοῦ ἐκ μέρους αὐτοῦ τούτου τοῦ λέγοντος, ἐὰν οὐκ ἔστι μόνον μέθοδος ἀσφαλῆς προσπορισμοῦ ὑλικοῦ κέρδους διὰ *δῆθεν* "πνευματικοῦ" ἔργου! Ὡσαύτως, ὑπετίμα ἂν τότε τὴν εὐφυΐαν τοῦ λέγοντος ἐὰν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ἐλογίζητο ἀπλῶς ὡς "εὐγένεια"! Κατὰ ταῦτα, τάνωτέρω ἐγράφησαν ἵν' ἀντιληφθῇτε τὸ πλήρες μέγεθος τοῦ πόνου τοῦ παρόντος λόγου, οὐχὶ ἵνα συμμερισθῇ τις τοῦτον ὅπερ οὐκ ἀναμένω ἐκ παχυδέρμων, ἀλλ' ἵνα *πάντα τὰ παρόντα λάβωσιν* ὑπ' ὄψιν ὡς *χοῖ παχύδερμοι* διὰ τὸ *συμφέρον αὐτοῖς*, ἐφ' ὅσον βεβαίως ἢ παχυδερμία ἔστω οὐκ ἔστι τοσαύτη ὥστε παραβλάπτειν ὡς καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ ὑλικά ἔστων συμφέροντα, διότι ἐὰν καὶ τοῦτο συμβαίνει, ἥδη ἀπώλεσα τὸν χρόνον μου ὡς οὐδεμία πλέον ὑπάρχει ἐλπίς περὶ τὸ πείθειν τοὺς ἐδῶ κατοικοῦντας ἀλλάξαι τρόπον σκέψεως καὶ συμπεριφορᾶς.

Νῦν δέ, ὡς πρὸς τὴν γλῶσσαν: Ἐνόμισαν πάντες οἱ δῆθεν τοῦ τόπου τούτου ταγοί, περὶ τὰ πνευματικὰ νωθοὶ διαμείναντες καὶ ἑαυτοὺς καὶ ἡλιθίους μόνον ὡς *πεισματικῶς ἠθελημένην* δικαιολογουμένην ἀγνωσίαν τῶν "Ἑλλήνων", εἰ διὰ νόμου ἐπέβαλον τὴν αἰσχρὰν καὶ ἀγράμματον γλῶσσαν ἢ σήμερον ἀνευθυρίαστος ὁμιλεῖται καὶ γράφεται ἐν Ἑλλάδι καὶ ὑπ' αὐτῶν τῶν καθηγητῶν, μὴδ' αὐτῶν πλέον κατανοούντων ὅτι ἐν γλώσσῃ μὴ ἀκριβεῖ μὴδὲν ἀκριβὲς καὶ τὸν νοῦν παιδεῦον δύναται νοηθῆναι ἢ ἐκφρασθῆναι! Ἡλιθιώτατα ἠδιαφόρησαν καὶ ἀδιαφοροῦσι πάντες οἱ ἐν Ἑλλάδι ἐγγράμμα-τοι τε καὶ ἀγράμματοι διὰ τὸ *ἱστορικὸν γεγονός* ὅτι ἡ ἐλληνικὴ γλῶσσα οὐκ ἔστι ἴδιον αὐτῶν κτῆμα ὃ δικαιοῦνται ἀναισχύντως σπηλοῦν, ἀλλ' ὅλης τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος, ἣν ὅμως αὐτοὶ *πρῶτοι* ἔχουσι χρέος, ἐὰν ἑαυτοὺς

Ἑλληνας θεωρῶσιν, διαφυλάξαι κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν ἀκεραίαν πρὸς αἰωνίαν παγκόσμιον χρήσιν! Διατί παραμένει ἀκόμη ἄγνωστον τοῖς εἰς ἄγνωσίαν παραδοῦσι τοὺς "κληρονόμους" τῶν γνῶσιν τοῖς λαοῖς δόντων, ὅτι γνῶσις μόνη ἐλευθεροῖ καὶ ἀγνοσία δεσμεύει; Ἐὰν δὲ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐστὶν ἄγνωστον αὐτοῖς, διατί οὗτοι οὕτως ὑποῦλως ἀπειργάσθησαν τῶν "κληρονόμων" τὴν δέσμευσιν; Ἄλλ' ἐὰν διὰ τῆς δῆθεν "δημοκρατίας" τῶν ἀγραμμάτων ἐπιβάλλωσιν ἑαυτοὺς ἐπὶ κείνων ἡμιμαθεῖς αὐθέντας, τί κρεῖττον ποιοῦσι τῶν βυζαντινῶν αὐτοκρατόρων πρώτων καὶ τῶν τούρκων σουλτάνων δευτέρων κομισάντων εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸ σκότος, μεταβαλόντων εἰς ὑπηκόους τοὺς πολίτας, τρίτοι τούτους σὺν ἐκείνοις εἰς δουλείαν συνεχῶς πωλοῦντες, τοὺς οὓς ὤφειλον παραμεῖναι μαθητὰς Σωκράτους καὶ Πλάτωνος; Τί δὲ κατώρθωσαν οὗτοι τοῦτο πράξαντες καὶ μὴ Ἑλληνας ἑαυτοὺς ἀποδείξαντες; Ἐν ἀκρισίᾳ, ἑαυτοὺς μὲν καταγελάστους ἐποίησαν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, διότι, π.χ., οὐδ' ἐπὶ στιγμὴν ἔθεσαν ἑαυτοὺς εἰς θέσιν ξένου τινὸς ἐπισκεπτομένου τὴν χώραν πλὴν ἀδυνατοῦντος ἀγοράσαι ἐνταῦθα εἴτε τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν Παλαιὰν Διαθήκην ἐν πρωτοτύπῳ (ἄνευ ἀνοήτων "καθηγητικῶν μεταφράσεων" εἰς τὴν σύγχρονον "ἐλληνικὴν" τῶν ἐσφαλμένων ξενογλώσσων μεταφράσεων τοῦ πρωτοτύπου), εἴτε καὶ λεξικὸν πλήρες αὐτῆς τῆς ἐλληνικῆς γλώσσης (ὡς ὅτι τὰ σήμερον ἐνταῦθα πωλούμενα λεξικά τῆς "ἀρχαίας καὶ νέας ἐλληνικῆς" οὐκ εἰσι σοβαρὰ λεξικά, ἀλλὰ μόνης τῆς διὰ νόμου ἀνοήτως ἐπιβληθείσης)! Τοὺς δ' ἐχθροὺς τῶν "Ἑλλήνων" ἰσχυροποίησαν, δόντες αὐτοῖς ἐπιχειρήματα (διότι τίς ὄντως ὁ δεσμὸς μεταξὺ ἀρχαίων καὶ νέων Ἑλλήνων, ἐὰν οἱ ὕστεροι, ἐν πλήρει φαυλότητι νοῦ τε καὶ βίου, καὶ διὰ τὴν γλῶσσαν καὶ τὰς πνευματικὰς ἀναζητήσεις τῶν πρώτων ἀποδεικνύσας τοσαύτην ἀνευρυθρίαστον ἀδιαφορίαν τῶν "οἰκίων" ἢ τῶν ἤδη ἐμπεπιπρασμένων, ἐφ' ὅσον βεβαίως δεσμὸς αἵματος οὐδὲ δύναται ἀποδείξασθαι, οὐδ' ἔστι δεκτὸς ἤδη ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰσοκράτους, ὀρίσαντος Ἑλληνα πάντα τῆς ἡμετέρας παιδείας μετέχοντα, εἰς συμπλήρωσιν τοῦ παλαιοτέρου καὶ ἀτελοῦς "πᾶς μὴ Ἑλλήν βάρβαρος", ὡς ἀρχὴν δηλαδὴ ἔκτοτ' ἀπαράβατον θέντος τὸ "πᾶς μὴ Ἑλλήν βάρβαρος, Ἑλλήν δὲ πᾶς τῆς ἡμετέρας παιδείας μετέχων" ἦν πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἑλλάδος ἔλκοντες τὴν πνευματικὴν ἢ τὴν καταγωγὴν ἐσεβάσθησαν καὶ μόνον οἱ "Ἑλληνες" καταφόρως περιεφρόνησαν, "Ἑλληνας" μὲν λέγοντες ἑαυτοὺς, πλὴν ἑαυτοὺς ἀποδεικνύντες, πλὴν τυφλοῖς, ἀνιέρους βαρβάρους τε καὶ μισέλληνας διὰ τῆς πλήρους πνευματικῆς καταρρεῦσεως τοῦ τόπου, ἧς ὑπερηφάνως προΐστανται ὡς "ταγοί", τυφλοὶ παραμένοντες πρὸ τοῦ ξένων γενικοῦ χλευασμοῦ, καὶ ἧς τὸ διαιωνιζόμενον γλωσσικὸν πρόβλημα ἀποτελεῖ μόνον τὴν ἐμφανῆ κορυφήν, διότι ἀπαντήσατέ μοι, παρακαλῶ, διατί ἐστὶ δῆθεν ἐλληνικώτερον τὰπαισίαν ὁσμὴν ἀποχέον "Ἑλλάδα" καὶ οὐχὶ τὸ "Ἑλλάδος" καὶ πῶς ἐστὶ δυνατόν πεῖσαι περὶ τούτου τοὺς ξένους γνωρίζοντας καὶ ἀναγνωρίζοντας μόνον τὸ δεύτερον κἀδυνατοῦντας κατανοῆσαι καὶ τὰς τῶν "Ἑλλήνων" ὅλως κενὰς διενέξεις περὶ τὴν γλῶσσαν καὶ τὸ πῶς ἐστὶ δυνατόν, εἰ Ἑλληνας πράγματι ἑαυτοὺς οἱ "Ἑλληνες" θεωροῦσι κάπο μόνου τάρχαίου ὀνόματος ἀποζῶντες καὶ ἔτι, πλὴν καθ' ὑποκλοπὴν, τυγχάνοντες τῆς εἰς ἐκείνους μόνους νενομισμένης τιμῆς, αἰσchrῶς πρὸ τοῦ κόσμου παντὸς ἑαυτοὺς ἀπεκδύειν τοῦ πνευματικοῦ

ἀρχαίου ἐνδύματος, μόνου αὐτοῦ δυναμένου περικαλύπτειν τὴν ἐλλειπὴν σημερινὴν ἔων γυμνότητα, ἐνῶ συγχρόνως ἀναιδῶς ἀπαιτοῦσι παρὰ τῶν ξένων ἀναγνωρίζειν αὐτοὺς μόνους κληρονόμους ὀνομάτων ἀρχαίων (ὄρα πρόβλημα ὀνομασίας ΦΥΡΟΜ), ὅτ' ἔτι καὶ αἱ ἀγελάδες κατὰ τὰρχαῖον ὀνομάζονται καὶ οὐχὶ κατὰ τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν ταγῶν ὀρισθέντα, πρὸς κρημνὸν ἀγόντων τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων! Τοὺς δὲ δυστυχεστάτους, πλὴν ἐν πελάγεσιν ἀφροσύνης καὶ "εὐτυχίας" πλέοντας "ὑπηκόους" πλέον ἀγραμμάτους καὶ οἰονεῖ δούλους κατέστησαν, τοὺς ἑαυτοὺς νομίζοντας ἐλευθέρων υἱούς, ἀδυνατοῦντας πλέον ὀρθῶς καὶ ἀρτίως σκέπτεσθαι καὶ ἐκφράζεσθαι (κατηργημένων, π.χ., πλέον οὐσῶν ὡς καὶ τῶν ἀναφορικῶν ἀντωνυμιῶν προτιμωμένου τοῦ "που", ὅπερ καθιστᾷ ὅλως ἀδιάκριτα ὀνόματα, ἐπίθετα καὶ κατηγορούμενα ὅλων τῶν ἀριθμῶν καὶ τῶν πτώσεων καὶ συνεπῶς ἀδύνατον τὴν κατανόησιν οἰουδήποτε συγκεκριμένου νοήματος χάριν ἄραγε τῆς σχετικότητος τοῦ παντός, ἐν ἀσχετοσύνῃ λεγόντων, γραφόντων, ἀκουόντων ἀναγιγνωσκόντων, νομιζομένου εἰς βαθεῖαν σοφίαν τοῦ ὅλως ἀνοήτου!). Διατὶ οὐδεὶς τῶν ἐνταῦθα ἐντρέπεται πλέον διότι οἱ ξένοι ὁμιλοῦσι, γράφουσι καὶ διδάσκουσι καλλίον' ἑλληνικά;

Ὡς δὲ πρὸς τὰς σχέσεις "Ελλήνων" καὶ ξένων νομίζουνσι πράγματι οἱ ἐνταῦθα περιπαθῶς πλὴν ὅλως ἡλιθίως ἄδοντες τὸ "οἱ ωραῖοι ἔχουν χρέη" ὅτι οἱ ξένοι σέβονται καὶ τιμῶσι τοὺς ἑαυτοὺς μὴ τιμώντας, ἔτι καὶ ὅτε χρησιμοποιοῦσιν αὐτοὺς εἰς ὑπηρεσίαν τῶν ἰδίων αὐτῶν συμφερόντων, ἃ μόνον τυφλοὶ τυφλῶς ὑπηρετοῦσι; Νομίζουνσι οἱ εἰς τὰς ἐνταῦθα ὑψίστας ὑπερῃφάνως καθεζόμενοι θέσεις, πλὴν μόνον εἰς αἰσχροῦς μικρότητος μὴ διαφευγούσας τῶν ξένων τῆς προσοχῆς κατατριβόμενοι καὶ τὸν τόπον ἀντιπροσωπεύοντες εἰς διεθνεῖς συναντήσεις, ἀλλ' οὕτως ἑαυτοὺς ἄκρως ἀνοήτους παγκοσμίως ἐπιδεικνύντες, ὅτι οἱ ξένοι ἀνεξαρτήτως τῆς καταστάσεως τοῦ τόπου αὐτῶν (ὅπου πάντως ἀπαστράπτει ἡ καθαριότης τοῦλάχιστον ὅπου οἱ πλείστοι τῶν πολιτῶν ἔων κατοικοῦσι καὶ κυκλοφοροῦσι) σέβονται τοῦλάχιστον αὐτοὺς προσωπικῶς καθ' ἣν στιγμὴν οὗτοι πέραν τῆς πολιτικῆς ἔων ἀφροσύνης οὐδὲ καθαρὸν διατηρῆσαι τὸν τόπον εἰσὶν ἱκανοί; Εἰσὶ σοφοί, εὐφυεῖς, ὅτε οὐκ ἀντιλαμβάνονται ὅτι τὸν ἐνταῦθα οὐσίᾳ γενικὸν σκουπιδότοπον, εἰ καὶ "Ελλάδα" ἀποκαλούμενον, ἀντιπροσωπεύουσι καὶ τὰ ἐνταῦθα σκουπίδια αὐτούσια ἐπὶ προσώπου ἔων περιάγουσιν ἀνὰ τὸν κόσμον; Ἀγνοοῦσιν οὗτοι, ἀγνοοῦσι πάντες οἱ ἀναίσχυντοι κάτοικοι τούτου τοῦ τόπου, ὅτι ὅταν οἱ Εὐρωπαῖοι ἐξοδεύωσι, πάντοτ' ἐξ ὑστερήματος, ἵνα γενῇ καὶ ὁ τόπος αὐτὸς καθαρὸς καὶ πεπολιτισμένος ὡς τόπος Εὐρώπης πρῶτος ἀπαυγάσας τὸ φῶς, ὃ πλέον σέβονται μόνοι ἐκεῖνοι, οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ "Ελληνες", τοῦλάχιστον ἀπαιτοῦσιν εὐρίσκειν αὐτὸν καθαρὸν, σῶφρονα καὶ οἰκεῖον ὅταν ἔρχωνται ἐνταῦθα; Τόσον αἰθαιροβάμονες εἰσι πλέον οἱ κάτοικοι, καθηγηταὶ ἀκαδημαϊκοί, ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ κυβερνήται τοῦ αἰσχροῦ καὶ θλιβεροῦ τούτου ἄστεος καὶ τόπου ὥστε μὴ καθορᾶν τὰ παντοειδῆ καὶ μηδέποτε συλλεγόμενα ἀλλ' εἰς λεπτότατον κοινορτὸν λειοτριβούμενα παρ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἰδίων ἀπορριπτόμενα καὶ ὡς νέφος ἐφ' ἡμέρας καὶ ἐβδομάδας αἰωρούμενα καὶ ἀναπνεόμενα περιττώματα ἔων, ἐφ' ὧν ἀναισχύντως πατοῦσι καθημερινῶς (καὶ ἐφ' ὧν σήμερον σημαίας σταυρὸν περιάγουσι), βλασφη-

μοῦντες πατρίδα, Εὐρώπην, πολιτισμὸν καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν Θεόν, καθ' οὗ τὸ Πρόσωπον τάποβάλλουσι χύδην, ἀδιαφοροῦντες, οἱ δῆθεν "Ορθόδοξοι", διὰ τὸ ὅτι ὡς οὐραίνος κατεσκευάσθη ὡς καὶ ἡ γῆ, διότι οὐδὲν ἀτελὲς κατεσκευάσθη διὰ χειρῶν τοῦ Κυρίου, δι' ὃ καὶ ζητηθήσεται ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀποδοσις; Εἰσὶ πάντες οὗτοι Ἕλληνες, ἢ βαρβάρων βαρβαρώτατοι; Πῶς θρασῶς ἀναμένονσι σεβασμὸν οἱ τοῖς ἰδίους περιπτώμασι συμφυρόμενοι; Ἐλέχθη, ΕΠΙ ΤΕΛΟΥΣ ΤΕΛΟΣ! Πότ' ἐπὶ τέλους τεύξεται τοῦτο ἐφαρμογῆς; Πότ' ἐπὶ τέλους ἀντιληφθήσονται οἱ ἐνταῦθα ὅτι ἀδυνατεῖ ὁ ἄνθρωπος συμφύρεσθ' ἐπὶ μακρὸν τοῖς ἰδίους αὐτοῦ περιπτώμασι πρὶν ὡς καὶ τὸς μεταβληθῇ εἰς περίπτωμα κάποβληθῇ ὡς τοιοῦτον; Ἀπὸ ἐτῶν ἤδη σκέπτονται οἱ Εὐρωπαῖοι βαλεῖν τὴν "Ελλάδα" ἀπὸ τῆς ἡνωμένης Εὐρώπης, δι' ἣν ὡς πεπολιτισμένοι ἄνθρωποι κείνοι, οὐχί γε ὡς ἄγιοι, αἰσθάνονται ἐντροπὴν, δι' ἣν ὡς σοβαροὶ καὶ τοῦλάχιστον ἑαυτοὺς σεβόμενοι ἄνθρωποι κείνοι αἰσθάνονται πηγαίαν ἀποστροφήν! Θέλουσιν οἱ ἐνταῦθα παντοειδεῖς κενοκέφαλοι "πατριῶται" ἰδεῖν ἑαυτοὺς ἀποβαλομένους; Τόσος ἐστὶ λοιπὸν ὁ τῶν "Ελλήνων" καὶ τῶν "Ορθόδοξων" μαζοχισμός; Καὶ οἱ μὲν λαϊκοὶ καθὼς ἐδιδάχθησαν οὕτω καὶ πράττουσιν! Ἄλλ' οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς; Εἰσὶ ὡς καὶ τοὶ ἐξ ἴσου μωροὶ καὶ ἐξ ἴσου ἄπιστοι; Διατί οὐ κλείουσι τὰς ἐκκλησίας κοῦ πεινθίμως κρούουσι τὰς καμπάνας ἕως ὅτου ὁ τόπος αὐτὸς ἐντραπῇ, σωφρονισθῇ καθαρισθῇ, πλυθῇ καὶ παύσῃ διὰ λαϊκῶν καὶ ἱερέων παντοιοτρόπως βλασφημεῖν τὸν Θεόν; Καὶ μὲν Ἐκεῖνος ἔτι ἀνέχεται καθορῶν πάντα, ἀλλὰ νομίζουν οἱ ἐνταῦθα ὅτι οἱ ξένοι οὐ βλέπουσι κοῦ ἀνατριχιάζουσιν, ἢ ὅτι ἔχουσι τὴν Θεῖαν Ὑπομονήν, ἢ πάντως οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀνεξάντλητος; Οὐκ ἐντρέπεται ἡ Ἐκκλησία τῆς Ἑλλάδος "διοικεῖσθαι" ὑπὸ προκαθημένου κἀρχιερέων οὐδεμίαν *γνησίαν* πνευματικότητ' ἀποπνεόντων καὶ τὴν χυδαίαν γλῶσσαν καὶ τρόπους μετερχομένων; Νομίζουν οἱ ἐνταῦθα ὅτι οἱ ξένοι ἀγνοοῦσι πάντα ταῦτα; Τοσαύτη οὖν ἐστὶν αὐτῶν ἡ ἡλιθιότης; Εἰ ἀπιστοῦντες Θεὸν οὐ φοβούνται, διατί τοῦλάχιστον οὐ φοβοῦνται τὴν ἐπερχομένην τῶν "ἀλλοθρήσκων" ξένων ὀργήν, δι' ᾧν τοῦ ὀβολοῦ *ἀχρεωστήτως καταβαλλομένου* οὗτοι διατηροῦντ' ἐν κραιπάλῃ, διασκεδάζοντες καὶ μὴ παραγωγικῶς ἐργαζόμενοι, καὶ δεινῶς δανειζόμενοι ἀναλίσκοντες ἐν *ἀσωτείαις* τὸν κοινὸν πλοῦτον, οὐδὲν οὕτως οὐσιῶδες ἀποδίδοντες πρὸς τὸ γενικὸν τῆς Εὐρώπης καλόν; Διότι, φρονῶ, *πᾶς τις δικαιούται* ἐρωτᾶν περὶ τῆς οὐσιώδους *σημερινῆς* συνδρομῆς τῶν ἐνταῦθα "Ελλήνων" εἰς τὸν κοινὸν πολιτισμὸν τῆς Εὐρώπης! Οὐκ αἰσχύνετ' ἐν ἐνεργείᾳ ὑπουργὸς παιδείας ψεύδεσθαι ἀυστόλως διακηρύσσων ὅτι "εδημιουργήσαμε δημόσια σχολεῖα ευρωπαϊκοῦ επιπέδου"; Ποίους ἐξαπατᾷ; Πόσα δημόσια σχολεῖα τῆς Εὐρώπης καὶ τῆς Ἀμερικῆς ἐπεσκέφθη καὶ τὴν ἐν αὐτοῖς γενομένην ἐργασίαν αὐτὸς κατενόησεν, ὥστ' ἀφόβως κάψευδῶς δηλοῦν τοῦτο; Πάντως οὐχὶ ὅσους ἐφ' ὀλόκληρον ζωὴν ἐγνώρισαν τὰ σχολεῖα ἐκεῖ! Ἔσχε δ' ἐπὶ πλεόν τὸ ἀσύστολον θράσος θεῖναι ἑαυτὸν ὑποψήφιον δι' ἀρχηγίαν "μεγάλου" κόμματος, ὅπερ δικαίως ἐχήρευσεν, τοῦ ἀνικάνου τέως ἀρχηγοῦ οὐδέποτε καθαιρεθέντος καὶ εἰσέτι μὴ συναισθανομένου τινὰ κατασχύνην περὶ τὴν ἐπὶ πολλὰ ἔτη συνδιαλλαγὴν τοῦ μετ' ἀρχαιοκαπήλων ᾧ οὐδένα ποτὲ παρέδωκε φυλακῇ, ἐνῷ ἡ χώρα μονίμως ἀπαιτεῖ τὴν ἐπιστροφήν τῶν ἀρχαίων ἴτης, ἅτινα ἐάν ποτ' ἐπι-

στραφῶσι, λάμπουσιν ὡς μαργαρίται ἐν βορβόρῳ, εἴ γε οὐ καταστραφῶσιν ἢ καὶ πάλιν κλαπῶσι! Πλὴν βεβαίως ἐὰν τὰ πράγματα διορθωθῶσιν (ὅπερ, φεῦ, ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος γελοῖον καὶ εἰπεῖν), ὥστε μεταβληθῇσθε' ὁ τόπος ἀπ' ἄκρου εἰς ἄκρον εἰς κῆπον ὑλικῆς καὶ πνευματικῆς εὐωδίας, ὅπου ἀπὸ μόνων οἱ ξένοι καὶ μετὰ χαρᾶς περισσῆς ἐπαναπατρίσουσι τὰ τοῦ κοινοῦ πολιτισμοῦ ἀρχαῖα κειμήλια!

Ὅντως φοβεροὶ οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι! Καὶ οὐκ ἐμοῦ, μὴ πολίτου, λέγειν! Ἄλλὰ γ' ἐμοῦ, ὡς φορολογουμένου καὶ "Ἑλλήνου" τῷ πνεύματι ἐγκαλοῦντος τὰ αἰσχυρὰ πρὸς διόρθωσιν, λέγειν! Πολυπληθεστάτη πασῶν ἡ "ἐλληνικὴ" κυβερνήσις! Ἄλλ' εἰς περαιτέρω ἔκπτωσιν τῶν ἀξιωματῶν ἀποβήσεται τοῦτο, ἐὰν ἐξακολουθήσῃ ἀδιαφοροῦσα διὰ τὰ πράγματι οὐσιώδη, ἅτινα μόν' ἀπεργάζονται τὰ ἐπουσιώδη. Ἀποτελεῖ κραυγαλέαν ἀνοησίαν τὸ κοινῶς ἐνταῦθα δοκούμενον ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ φυσικοῦ οἱ ξένοι τόποι ἐγένοντο καὶ εἰς πλούσιοι τε καὶ καθαροί, ἢ ὅτι ἀδίκως ἀπολαμβάνουσι τοῦ γενικοῦ σεβασμοῦ ὃν οὐκ ἀνταποδιδόασιν τῇ "Ἑλλάδι"! Κύριοι, τοῦτ' ἔχω εἰπεῖν: Ἐγένοντο πλούσιοι, παρέμειναν καθαροί καὶ ἐπέβαλον σεβασμὸν διὰ τῆς τιμίας, μεθοδικῆς, συντόνου, περισκέπτου, σκληροτάτης, μακράϊωνος καὶ ὁμονοούσης χειρωνακτικῆς καὶ πνευματικῆς ἐργασίας πάντοτ' ἀποβλεπούσης εἰς ἔργα ὑψίστης ποιότητος, συμβαλλούσης ἀδιαπτῶς τῆς συνεχοῦς φροντίδος πάντων τῶν κατοίκων αὐτῶν, δηλαδὴ δι' ἀρετῶν ἃς ὁ πολὺς καὶ ὁ ὀλίγος "Ἕλλην" ἐγκατέλειπε ἤδη ἀπὸ τῆς βυζαντινῆς ἐποχῆς διαφθαρεῖς, γεγονὼς νωθρός, δοκῶν δῆθεν "χριστιανικῶς" ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἀνευ τινὸς αὐτῶν κόπου σώζει τοὺς *μαλακῶς* οὕτω "πιστεύοντας", καὶ ἔκτοτε ἐκ τῶν ἄνω ἀναμένων τὴν σωτηρίαν, ἀναλίσκόμενος εἰς κενὰς "προσευχὰς" μᾶλλον ἢ ἔργα, χλευάζων τοὺς ἄλλους διότι δῆθεν "δὲν γνωρίζουν νὰ ζοῦν" ἐνῷ οὗτος γνωρίζει(!), μὴ αἰσχυρόν ἐστιν ὅτι δῆθεν "ἐπαιτεῖν ἀφ' ὧν οὐς λοιδορεῖ· ὁ μόνος λοιδωρὸς καὶ πλεον ἀπολίτιστος ἔως ἀγράμματος τελευταῖος αὐτὸς αὐθεντῶν ἀναιδὴς ὑπὴρκοος καὶ ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ αὐτοῦ τόπῳ ἄξενος ξένος, οὐχὶ πλέον πολίτης ζῶν ἐν Εὐρώπῃ! Πράγματι ἀπαιτεῖται ὑπέρβασις! Ἄλλ' οἱ ἐνταῦθα μόνον κενὰς λέξεις γνωρίζουσι καὶ ἐκφράζουσιν! Ἡ οὐσία καὶ τὸ μέγεθος τῆς ἀπαιτουμένης ὑπερβάσεως ἀπ' αὐτῶν διαφεύγει, διότι οὐδεμίαν ἔχουσιν *ἔσω πληροφορίαν* περὶ τοῦ πῶς ἐγένοντο οἱ ξένοι μεγάλοι ἐνῷ αὐτοὶ περιέπεσαν εἰς μικρότητα! Μεταξὺ τῶν πολλῶν κενῶν λόγων περιδινόμενοι, οὐκ ἔχουσι καιρὸν σκέπτεσθαι πρωτίστως περὶ ἑαυτῶν, διότι γνωρίζουσιν ὅτι οὐδὲν ἀρεστὸν ἀνακαλύψουσιν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, τὸ ἤδη παρ' ἄλλων διαπιστούμενον! Ὡς οἱ Ἀμερικανοὶ λέγουσιν· Κύριοι, οὐχὶ *ὑπάρχει δωρεὰν φαγητόν!* Οὐχὶ ὑπάρχουσιν ἀπὸ μηχανῆς θεοὶ λύοντες τὰνθρώπων προβλήματα, ἅτιν' ὑμεῖς συνεχῶς μετατίθετε εἰς τὸ πλέον ἀνυπέρβλητον μέλλον, τὸ νῦν παρὸν γεγονός, εἰς θεατρισμοὺς ἀναλώσαντες ἑαυτοὺς ἤδη ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχαίας ἐποχῆς μᾶλλον ἢ εἰς τὴν μελέτην Σωκράτους καὶ Πλάτωνος, *ἀψευδῶς καταγγειλάντων* τὴν ἀπάτην τῶν ὑφ' ὑμῶν μόνων τιμωμένων "πολιτικῶν" τε καὶ "ποιητῶν", ὧν τὸν μὲν ἐδηλητηριάσατε, τὸν δὲ ἐπωλήσατε ὡς δοῦλον, τὸν μόνον ἐλεύθερον, ἐνῷ ἔτι δοκεῖτε ὅτι ἔτι ἐστὶ δυνατόν, ὡς ἂν ποτ' ἦ δυνατόν λυθῆναι ὑμῶν τὰ προβλήματα τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν ἀβρόχων διαμενόντων, καθὼς ἄλλοι, οὐχὶ μόνον ἄνθρωποι ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ οἱ θερμοδυναμικοὶ καὶ φυσικοὶ νόμοι

φυσικῶς μεταβαλλόμενοι ὡς πνευματικῶς ὀκνηροὶ ἡλιθίως δοκεῖτε, διαπε-
ραιώσουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἀντίπεραν τοῦ χειμάρρου!

Κύριοι, ἐπιτρέψατέ μοι τελευταίας τινὰς ἐρωτήσεις: Ἐπὶ τέλους, γε-
νήσεσθ' ὅτε ἱκανῶς σοβαροὶ ὥστ' ἀνακόψητ' ἂν μὴ τι ἄλλο τὸν χλευασμὸν
τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑμῶν καὶ τὴν λύπην τῶν φίλων ὑμῶν; Ἐργάσεσθ' ὅτε ὡς εἰς
ἄνθρωπος, παύοντες τὴν ἀκατάσχετον καὶ τυφλὴν ἀδελφοκτόνον διχόνοιαν;
Δέξεσθ' ὡς λύσεις τὰς ἀπὸ μακροῦ τοῖς πᾶσι πλὴν ὑμῖν γνωστὰς λύσεις,
καὶ ὡς μὴ λύσεις τὰς ὑφ' ὑμῶν μόνων νομιζόμενας ὡς "λύσεις"; Ἐγκατα-
λήψετε ὡς ἄχρηστον πᾶν ὅπερ ἤδη ἀπεδείχθη ψευδές; Ἀγαπήσετέ ὅτε
τὴν ἀλήθειαν; Αἰσχυνεῖσθ' ὅτε διὰ πᾶν ἥσσοις ποιότητος προῖον τῆς
χειρὸς ὑμῶν ἢ τῆς σκέψεως, διὰ τὴν ἐπαίσχυντον ἥσσοις ὑμετέραν προσ-
πάθειαν, διὰ τὰ σύστολα ὑμῶν ψεύδη, διὰ τὴν ἀπάτην καὶ αἰσχροτήτητα τοῦ
δημοσίου καὶ ἰδιωτικοῦ βίου καὶ τὴν συμπεριφορὰν ὑμῶν, πάντα καταστάν-
τα συνώνυμα τοῦ "ελληνικοῦ" ὀνόματος ὧν ἕνεκα οἱ ξένοι δικαίως ἀναγκά-
ζονται τηρεῖν συνεχῶς αὐξομένης ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἀποστάσεις; Παύσετε ἐπὶ
τέλους ἀηδῶς ἀναξέειν πληγὰς παλαιάς, βρωμεράς, ἐξ ὧν οὐδὲν ἐδιδάχθη-
τε, ὥς οὕτως οὐκ ἀφίετε ἐπουλοῦσθαι; Ἀποβλέψετε εἰς μόνον τὸ μέλλον
τοῦ κοινοῦ πολιτισμοῦ, οὐχὶ πλέον εἰς τὸ θλιβερὸν παρελθὸν καὶ δὴ τὸν τρό-
πον αὐτοῦ οὗ ἕνεκα τοῦτο ὀπίσω ἀφήκεν ὑμᾶς; Γενήσεσθε ἐπὶ τέλους πολί-
ται ὑμεῖς, ἑαυτοὺς παρουσιαζόντες καθ' ὅλ' ἀξίους υἱοὺς τῶν πρώτων ἐπὶ
γῆς πολιτῶν, παύοντες μετέχειν πολιτείας ἀσέμνου μετερχόμενοι ἀνήθικα
μέσα, ἢ παραμενεῖτε ἀναιδεῖς *δηθεν* "ἀριστοκράται" ἐπαῖται ἀπεχθανόμε-
νοι τὴν σύντονον ἐργασίαν νοῦ καὶ χειρὸς, ἀλλὰ μὴ ἐντρεπόμενοι παρ' ἄλ-
λων (ὧν τὴν ἀγάπην κινδυνεύετ' ἐξαντλεῖν πλήρως) ἀπαιτεῖν τὰ πρὸς τὸ
πολυτελῶς ζῆν ἀναγκαῖα, οὗ καὶ ὧν οὐκ ἀξίους ἀπεδείξατε ἑαυτοὺς;

Δι' ὑμᾶς θρηνῶν, *ἠθελημένως* ζωντανοὺς νεκροὺς ὑμᾶς καταστάντας,

Ξένος Ἕλλην ἐν ἀξένοις "Ἕλλησι"

Παρὰ τοῦ κ. Μαρίνου καὶ ὑπὸ ἡμερομηνίαν 16ης Νοεμβρίου 1993, ἔλαβον
τὴν κάτωθι ἀπάντησιν:

Αγαπητέ κ. Σταυρόπουλε

Σας ευχαριστῶ πολὺ γιὰ τὸ ἐξαιρετικὰ ἐνδιαφέρον γράμμα σας, τὸ
οποῖο ἐδιάβασα με πολλή προσοχὴ καὶ σε αρκετὰ σημεία τοῦ διαπίστωσα
ὅτι οἱ ἀπόψεις μας καὶ οἱ ἀνησυχίες μας εἶναι κοινές. Πιστεύω ὅτι τὰ ὅσα
μου γράψατε θὰ με βοηθήσουν στὴν δημοσιογραφικὴ μου προσπάθεια τὴν
οποία φαίνεται νὰ ἐκριμάτε.

Δυστυχῶς δὲν μου παραχωρεῖται χώρος γιὰ νὰ δημοσιεύω τὶς ἐπι-
στολές που ἔχουν τὴν καλωσύνη νὰ μου στέλλουν πολλοὶ ἀναγνώστες τοῦ
"Βήματος". Συνεπῶς δὲν μπορῶ νὰ φιλοξενήσω τὴν ἐπιστολή σας, ἡ ὁποία
ἄλλωστε οὕτως ἢ ἄλλως, λόγῳ τῆς μεγάλῃς ἐκτάσεως δὲν εἶναι δυνατόν νὰ
δημοσιευθεῖ (θὰ χρειαζόταν χώρος δύο σελίδων τοῦ "Βήματος").

Re: ΠΕΡΙ ΛΥΣΕΩΣ ΤΟΥ ΠΡΟΒΛΗΜΑΤΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΟΝΟΜΑΣΙΑΣ ΤΟΥ ΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΤΩΝ ΣΚΟΠΙΩΝ

Ἄξ. Κύριον Ἀντώνιον Σαμαρᾶν,
Πρόεδρον Κόμματος Πολιτικῆς Ἀνοίξεως
Ἀθήνας.

6 Ἰουνίου 1994.

Κύριε Σαμαρᾶ:

Ἐπὶ τοῦ προβλήματος τῶν Σκοπίων: Ἀναμφιβόλως

(α) διὰ τῆς ἐπιμονῆς ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ ζήτημα τῆς μικτῆς ὀνομασίας κρατεῖτε δέσμια τὰ δύο μεγάλα κόμματα,

(β) μεταξὺ τῶν λογικῶς ἀντικειμένων κάμετακινήτως κρατουμένων Ἑλληνικῶν καὶ Σκοπιανῶν θέσεων, οὐδεὶς συμβιβασμὸς ἐστὶ δυνατός,

(γ) εἰλικρινῶς οἱ ξένοι ἀπέκαμον πρὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ περὶ τὸ πρόβλημα τοῦτο, διότι ἀπολύτως οὐδεμία πρότασις ὀνόματος ἐγένετό ποτ' ἀπὸ μέρους Ἑλλάδος. Οὐ δικαιούμεθ' ἀπαιτεῖν ὅπως ἄλλοι λύωσι τὰ προβλήματα!

Λυποῦμαι λέγειν τὸ φανερόν: *λείπει* ἀπὸ μέρους τοῦ ἑλληνικοῦ πολιτικοῦ κόσμου ἡ φαντασία, τὸ θάρρος, ἡ γνώσις τῆς δυνάμεως τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης, καὶ τὸ *humor*.

Δι' ὃ παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς πρῶτον, ὅπως *ἀμέσως* ἀλλάξητε στάσιν καὶ καλέσητε *πάντας τοὺς Ἕλληνας*, κόμματα καὶ κυβέρνησιν ἀναγνωρίσαι *ἀμέσως* τὸ κράτος τῶν Σκοπίων, καὶ ἐφ' ἐξῆς χρῆσθαι *ἄνευ οἰουδήποτε δισταγμοῦ ἢ παρεκκλίσεως* κατὰ πάντα πρὸς πάντας γραπτὸν καὶ προφορικὸν λόγον τὴν ἀκόλουθον *μικτὴν ὀνομασίαν*, καὶ διαμηνύσαι *ἀμέσως* εἰς πάντα τὸν κόσμον ὅτι ἡ *Ἑλλάς ἀμέσως καὶ μονομερῶς αἶρει τὸ embargo* καὶ ἀνοίγει τὴν χώραν (ἔδαφος, θάλασσαν καὶ ἀέρα) εἰς τὴν *ἐλευθέραν* (πλήν κειμένην ὑπὸ τοὺς διεθνεῖς νόμους) διακίνησιν ταχυδρομείου καὶ ἐμπορευμάτων ἀπὸ καὶ πρὸς τὸ κράτος τῶν Σκοπίων, ὑπὸ τὸν **παντελῶς ἀπαράβατον ὅρον** χρήσεως καὶ ἀναγραφῆς ἐπὶ παντὸς κειμένου, ἀλληλογραφίας ἢ ἐμπορικῆς ἀποστολῆς, *τοῦλάχιστον διακινουμένης μέσω Ἑλλάδος*, ἐπὶ ποινῇ ἐπιστροφῆς τοῦ φορτίου ἀντιστοίχως ὡς **ἀπαρεδέκτου ἀποστολέως ἢ ἀγνώστου διευθύνσεως παραλήπτου**, τῆς ἑλληνικωτάτης ὀνομασίας τοῦ Σκοπιανοῦ κράτους ὡς **ΨΕΥΔΟΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΑ (PSEUDOMACEDONIA) !!!**

Ὑπομᾶτε δεινῶς τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ *humor* δεσμεῖν καὶ λύειν καὶ τὴν ἱκανότητα τῶν ξένων ἐκτιμᾶν καὶ γελᾶν ἐν ἐποχῇ καθ' ἣν τὸ γνήσιον τοιοῦτον παγκοσμίως ἀπουσιάζει! Πολὺς ἀπέστι καιρὸς ἀφ' ἧς οἱ Ἕλληνες γνησίως ἐγέλασαν καὶ ἐνίκησαν, διότι ἀπέλιπεν ἡ γνώσις, τὸ θάρρος ἡ πί-

στις! Ἄκρως ἀνόητοι ἐπέβαλον ἐν Ἑλλάδι τὴν ἀγνωσίαν τῆς ἐλληνικῆς γλώσσης ὥσθ' οἱ Ἕλληνες ἀγνοεῖν τὴν παγκόσμιον κυριαρχίαν τῶν *καλῶν* Ἑλληνικῶν! Τὰ φιλοσοφικὰ καὶ θεολογικὰ παρ' Ἑλλήσι γνωστὰ ὡς κείμενα τοῦ Διονυσίου Ἀρεοπαγίτου ἀποδίδονται παρὰ τῶν ξένων τινὶ ἀγνώστῳ *Pseudodionysius*, *ἀνευ τινὸς ὑποτιμήσεως τῆς ἀξίας αὐτῶν*. Σημειῶ τοῦτο ὥστε χρησιμοποιοιθῇ ὡς **ἀπολύτως παραδεκτὸν ἐπιχείρημα** κατὰ παντὸς φρονούντος κατὰ τῆς ἐλληνικωτάτης αὐτῆς λύσεως, ἥτις οὐδὲν *ἐγκλείει περιφρονητικὸν πνεῦμα*, ὅμως ἐν ταύτῳ δηλοῖ καὶ ἀναγνωρίζει τὸ δικαίωμα παντὸς ἀποκαλεῖσθαι ὡς θέλει, βεβαίως γε ὑπὸ τὸν ὅρον τῆς σαφοῦς ὁμολογίας ὅτι ἱστορικῶς οὐ δικαιούται αὐτοῦ! Τὸ πρόβλημα οὕτω μετακινήθησεται ἐφ' ᾧν ἐξακολουθήσουσιν ἐπιθυμεῖν ἀποδεκνύναι τοὺς Σκοπιανούς οὐχὶ ψευδο-, ἀλλὰ Μακεδόνας γνησίους!

Ὡς δὲ πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἡ τοιαύτη πολιτικωτάτη μεταστροφή, δοκῶ, μᾶλλον μεγάλως ὀφελήσῃ ὑμᾶς ἐν ᾧ τῶν ἐκλογῶν. **A bold stroke is needed and your opponents *cannot* deliver it!** The one is too old, the other too fat, and all the rest too irrelevant!

Μετὰ πάσης τιμῆς,

60

**Re: THE PRESENT-DAY DUTIES OF
CHRISTIANS**

His Grace Dr. John Carey,
Archbishop of Canterbury,
Lambeth Palace,
London SE1 7JU,
England.

7 September, 1994.

Your Grace:

May the Lord's Grace be always with yours! I am addressing you as the religious Head of the Church of England, the most respected of the Protestant Churches, on a matter *very* Protestant in spirit and of the utmost importance for all Christians and indeed all men, that I am certain will hold your attention to the end. Please rest assured that I am fully aware of the gravity of what I shall state below, that I have tried to arrange logically and as conducively as I can manage to the higher duty before us all. For *who* I am, please see the biographical note at the end.

I

Your Grace will agree that (a) *the Lord Himself is not happy* with our world and, therefore, that *no Christian* may be happy with it; and (b) whatever hope for improvement still exists can only turn into fact by *us men*, whose only duty *is* to turn hope into fact; or else, *we force His hand!* Your Grace will also agree that we Christians have *always* looked *backwards* to the time of the Lord's *First Coming*, *not forward* to His *Second Coming!* Even so, we have *not* understood, *why men failed* to recognize *Him right away* when He first came as the Messiah they expected!: That was due solely to the *fact* that *they had never cared to develop their understanding* of what Messiah meant or of the *only way* in which He would come! Your Grace, I submit that to the extent analogies permit, *we repeat that grievous mistake* as regards His *Second Coming!* We *dread* the Day, but only in the measure of our *unbelief*, *not* of our *sinfulness*; *not* because we find our sins so great that not even the Lord's Love can overcome, but

because *we know we lack* that *grain* of faith upon which He can work our salvation! Without doubt, the Lord's desire is *not* that we look backwards, except only in order to take *lessons and strength* for the duty *ahead*; which is to *prepare the world* for His *Second Coming*; and *not just* our souls as best each of us can, *narrowly, in the face of death*! It is fully in the measure of our *unbelief and lack of understanding of the analogy between the two Comings* that we see the Second Coming *figuratively*! For that double failure, the Christians *only just pray* for their souls, *which objectively is a wholly egotistical and not truly pious concern*, unaware of the *fact* that this *proves doubtful their trust* in the Lord to see them through, and *distracts them from their clear duty to prepare for the Day of the Lord in every manner*! What I mean is that it should *not* have escaped us that the Lord has placed *us men* stewards of this world! That Judgment shall be the Judgment of *our entire stewardship*! That admission to the Other World is earned for *good stewardship*, not just the familiar "good deeds" narrowly understood! When the Christians *only pray passively* in the familiar manner, and *do not involve themselves actively* in the affairs of this world to prepare *it for that Day*, in effect they impertinently hand back to the Lord, *as if they were His*, their own duties of stewardship! This is a *serious criticism*! Which I hope your Grace will *not* regard impertinent! History has shown that the older Churches do *not* take the *needed* criticism kindly! Unquestionably, the Protestant criticism has served God's purposes; but can we be certain it has *completed* serving them, or rather that *there is still plenty of work ahead*? That we are still here is the *proof* that our work *is not yet done*! If History can still teach, we men must learn that it is wiser to criticize ourselves while there is still time, *thus also preparing* for the Day of the Lord, rather than passively waiting for the Lord's Judgment when the time shall be up!

When as Disciples we asked about the *time* of His return, the Lord told us that *should not* be our concern, that *we must look for the signs* that shall herald His Coming! As it is blasphemous to say that God has overlooked anything, has not thought through everything, has left anything out of place that was His to set right; and as the *signs* relate to the *conditions* that *must* be fulfilled *before* the Lord can return; it is clear that the Lord asked that *we study closely the conditions for His Coming*! *What then is our present duty*? A critical examination shows that, whereas before the collapse of atheist systems our mundane activities could be excused on combating them, by which we fooled ourselves; now that such systems are no threats, our mundane activities can be excused on *nothing* spiritual! It is *not* just that our "politics" is in urgent need of "spiritual" support! It is that *to function at all as human, we need to give spiritual significance* to our daily activities! Which *few* now do! This is *deeply political*, since men *cannot* function as proper citizens even of this world *unless they actively prepare for the Other*! Now, *not exactly suddenly*, it is seen *clearly* that the vast

majority of the people out there have *no* clear idea of *what they live for*! As Christians, we may *not* ignore this *ominous* development, now fully upon us! That “this has happened before” *cannot* be an excuse for doing nothing!: Firstly, this has *not* happened before to an equal extent! Secondly, we now race with a *dizzying accelerating* speed, not imagined even a few years ago! *But what we race towards, we know not, care about not*! From their public pronouncements and by running their affairs as usual, *all* “spiritual” institutions, but especially the Churches, *reveal themselves to be impotent passive observers*, unable to grasp the *quality and magnitude* of the problem! What is the clear duty of *Christians* in these times so unlike all others, nobody seems to know or care about! Though relative to it, *all* other problems *are* trivial! Surely, it is giving your Grace great concern that the people are no longer inspired and nothing out there inspires them! “Progress”, however useful, only on matters of this world, even on such as healing and preventing disease is *not* a good in itself when one does *not* know what he lives for, other than just living—*for nothing*! For the Christian, *this situation is entirely unacceptable and must change*, as your Grace will agree!

The observed spiritual dearth *is surely among the signs*! That the situation *must* change *surely indicates the end of the era*! But the new era that dawns *cannot* be at all like this one or any past one! We have tasted the fruit of past promises! *None* of them, *including the implicit Christian promises*, brought the millennium! Traditional Christianity did not just promise only the Other World; *it promised to make this world the antechamber of the Other*! It did *not*! After the initial turbulent period, it too simmered down to *nothing much*! And this after *reversing the progress, science and knowledge it had found ready*! It made us lose *more than a thousand years* and we had to retreat before science could regain a footing! But neither science brought the millennium; what it delivered proved *unsatisfying* and only made matters *worse*! The mayhem of this century, still going on, is half-due to science; the spiritual devastation we experience is *all* due to science, *that we chose to misread and misapply*! The *foolish* hope some entertain that we may be able to unlearn science *is pure denial born of desperation*! Pandora’s box has been left open for so long that especially *that* hope *has* escaped, *and a very good thing too*! A return to the *blind* religious “faiths” of the past is *not* in God’s plan! *But also, more of the same* science, providing at best *only* for *material* goods, leaving thirsty the spirit, shall only *worsen* our life! Another era, *even somewhat like this one*, *will only be a continuation for the worse and will not be new*! The failure in turn of both “Christianity” and “science” can *only* have been due to that *each rejected the other*! The new era, either the one *prophesied* or one bringing closer to it, *must* combine Faith in God *and* Science! *Not* the *shallow* “faith” and *false* “science” we have known, but *other*; the *true parts of hope and good stewardship*, that we men alone must

provide! The facts before us make it imperative *that we examine closely the signs, conditions, and what has brought us here and where it leads us!* With an *unflinching Christian* critical eye! About the past, no more is needed here. About the future, perhaps, the examination of *just one* condition is enough!:

Unquestionably and not without cause, we have turned unfaithful, suspicious, distrustful; we no longer find it enough but *demeaning* that people should try to appeal *only* to our *sentiment*, that in the past *they have only exploited to our loss*; we want them to engage our *reason*; *we no longer want to "believe", but to be shown*; we want things *proved* to us to believe them! It is a very sad historical fact that the Christian Church, has *never* sought to engage our reason, only our "faith", *sans Reason*! That *Reason is part of the Christian Faith*, and that the latter *cannot* be complete without the former, this the Church has *not* seen! Your Grace will see that this *cannot* have been part of the Lord's plan for us; that *before* the end, *God cannot but oblige our quest for a union of Faith and Reason*! If, *as most people wrongfully believe*, Reason and Faith "must" always stand apart, then, man stands literally on the razor's edge and absolutely nothing exists that can *logically* incline him in this rather than that direction! But this *is blasphemy* against both God *and* man! Against God, for arguing that He could not make things better, but rely on the winds of "fate" (read, *chance*!) to push man in this rather than that direction! Against man for arguing that he must cut off his reason and become a cripple and a will-less vessel of raw sentiment called "faith" in order to be "saved"! Against God *and* man, for arguing that *only such* may enter God's bliss, in *such only* may God find pleasure, *only such* may find pleasure in God! Besides, wouldn't the union of Faith and Reason *call the bluff* of those who *willfully* reject the Faith, thinking themselves secure in the *false* belief that Reason shall never confront them with it? Might we men in good faith discount the possibility that the Lord *had already seen to that our bluff be called before the end*? Which, moreover, *would guarantee* that those who shall still reject Him shall no longer do so in good faith, but in *full knowledge* of what they themselves have demanded as *sufficient* proof of *His* existence and Law, and that they therefore shall *deserve* to be treated *according to their rejection of that proof*? Indeed, one would have a *very hard* time arguing that this is not the way of God's Justice; *that is doubly just* for proving the unjust to be unjust not only according to His measure, *but also according to theirs*! Indeed, without this *double* guarantee, the Lord's imposition of Justice *would* be one-sided, and the devil *could and would* argue that it was "arbitrary"! The proof according to *their* measure *would remove even that last doubt*! Your Grace, the Lord *foresaw our unbelief from the beginning and has now obliged us*! And at least *this most important condition is now fulfilled*.

2

How? By two measures, *none* of which even the most hardened atheists can discount!: The first *is this very material universe*, by which they swear! The second *is the human intellect*, by which also they swear! As regards the first measure, Your Grace, please consider the following three propositions:

(a) **The material universe contains everything material**; to which *nobody* can object, and which is *tested absolutely correct*, beyond current scientific conceptions!

(b) **The material universe is governed by objective Law**; *not* a “law”, “discovered” (=invented) by scientists, dependent on their assumptions and subject to change whenever they change their assumptions; but a *Law tested truly existing out there and obeyed by the universe*; such that *they cannot* dispute, alter, impose, or remove!

(c) **No material agency exists that is the origin of the objective Law**; *nothing* in the material universe, *no property of matter* in it, or *it as a whole* is the origin of the Law; *also tested absolutely correct* by the most rigorous analysis of the *objective hard facts out there*, *free* of human supposition and *every conceivable objection*!

Faced with these propositions, **are we logically compelled to conclude an immaterial agency**! Your Grace, please note and be satisfied that *nothing* in the nature of things out there, or this argument *as stated* contains a *hidden flaw*! *If no flaw can be found in it now, it shall never be found*! At any rate, if any one person or small group of persons hesitate to decide the truth of the matter, there are today *untold* millions of people able to read for themselves and as a body decide *the absolute truth of and the absence of untruth* in these statements; hardly the state of affairs in centuries past when one argued *without hard scientific support, or proof of objective Law of Nature guaranteed by measurement and number*!

As regards the second measure, please consider: **We all must agree that all law is a mental construct, and that antecedent to it comes the mind**! Even the law of parliaments though written on paper, is *not* law because it is written on paper, in other words, because it is expressed by material paper and ink, but because *it is understood to be law in the minds of people reading it, recognizing it to have formed in the minds of legislators before it was put on paper, and comprehending it as necessary to regulating the relations of individuals in society*! So, too, the objective Law: (a) *is tested to be regulative of relations truly existing out there between and among the (fundamental) particles of matter making up the universe, that becomes a universe (as opposed to chaos) only by the existence of said universal regulative Law!*; and (b) *is understood to be Law, not only because it is expressed powerfully out there by matter, but also*

*because the human mind recognizes it to be necessary to regulate relations truly existing out there! Nothing can prevent us from understanding that antecedent even to the Law of Nature was a mind, deserving to be called the Mind!: Indeed, faced with the fact that the Law is present objectively out there, and the fact that no material agency exists having generated it, we are compelled to conclude that **antecedent to the hard Law of Nature was the Mind that thought it out!** So now: **as Mind means Person, the immaterial origin of the objective Law is shown to be the Personal God!***

Without objection to this whole line of thought and this last conclusion, the existence of Personal God as *Mind thinking the hard Law, as Creator creating the universe according to that Law, and as God having His Law obeyed by the inanimate material world, is fully proven beyond all objection! Obviously, there is *nothing* here of the nature of the scholastic so-called arguments and proofs! It is necessary that Your Grace feel *fully satisfied with this entire argument!**

3

If the logic of the argument itself is unbeatable, whether the conclusion is valid rests *solely* on the *hard physical facts that tested by science prove the objective Law of Nature as a product of Mind!* Your Grace may feel as secure of the truth of this statement (a) as you are of the *fact* that if you took a priceless delicate vase in your hands and let go of it, it would come down and smash on the floor!; and (b) as you *can* be of the *fact* that, *contrary to false statements of current science* to the effect that the phenomena taking place inside the chemical atoms are the product of chance and no law exists uniting them, *the long lists of numbers known as atomic spectrographic data are all produced by a single Law of Nature equally as hard as the Law of gravity!* Whether we like it or not, the catastrophe of values we now face *has been caused mainly by professors peddling relativity and indeterminacy under cover of science!* Those two have been represented as bearing directly on the *structure* of the physical world, and arguing that *Logic* is such that the world *cannot* be non-relative and determinate! I wonder whether the Christians realize fully what this means!: *If the world be relative and indeterminate as a matter of Logic, if no absolute here and there, before and after exist in it, then nothing determines or can determine what happens in it, and so, not even God can tell what happens in it or could have put together what even He could not have known how to put it together!* The *theological* implications of this, and the horrendous blasphemy it spells out *are clear!* Except, perhaps, to those with little or no understanding of the *binding nature* of Logic! Honestly, I *cannot experience* a theologian's understanding of these things! (The principle “τ' ἀδύνατα παρ' ἀνθρώποις δυνατὰ παρὰ τῷ

Θεῶν” *cannot* supersede Logic and is *not* equivalent to the *correct* “what looks impossible to men may be possible for God”, which it in fact means! Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος!) But as an *engineer* having examined and worked in the bowels of the Earth, having studied the *hard* science that permits the *difficult* conversion of mineral to pure metal and other useful material, and having produced processes for such conversions, I can assure your Grace that *the problem of Creation is a problem of engineering so complete that nothing has escaped the Lord’s attention!* When an engineer overlooks “details”, he either cannot do his work at all, or soon faces *worse* problems resulting from the “details” he overlooked! I as a *Christian* have regarded it blasphemous to say that I as an *engineer* am wiser than the Creator! Others have *not* been as scrupulous! Of course, we should *not* be fooled by the fact that in the intermediate scale of our immediate observation, natural things do not look like having been engineered! *That is where we are called to make our contribution as stewards!* In *all* other scales, we are mere spectators! Already, as can be seen under the microscope, *every seed, every leaf, every organ are all structured!* By obeying the law of gravity, the universe suggests having a structure *permitting it to obey* that law! *That structure has now been revealed!* By behaving *predictably*, the atoms suggest having a structure permitting the predictability of their behavior! *That structure too has now been revealed!* It is *very sad* that professors “argue” that the structures out there are only products of chance, when they themselves do *nothing* by chance and the roofs under which they sleep have *not* been built by chance, yet, are infinitely simpler than those other natural structures! It was with all my scientific and concrete engineering experience, and with the deep sense of the *fact* that *engineered structures never result from relativity, indeterminacy and chance*, that in 1974 I started to *examine carefully* the foundations of natural Law and “scientific” statement! And what I found *was astounding!* First off, “scientific” statements had been made on *very inadequate* understanding of the *hard physical and logical* issues present in natural Law! As to the large scale, suffice it here to say that the *great* importance of Newton’s law of gravity *had been missed*; that the solid findings of relativity are *not* due to its truth, but to the *fact* that *photons have real mass identical to that of ordinary bodies*; and that, as it can be determined based on the law of gravity, the universe *is structured* on *absolute, non-relative* Law *recognizing the exact-to-the-moment age of the universe*, such that relativity *is intrinsically unable* to discover! As to the small scale, as it *has* been determined based on the voluminous spectrographic data, the atoms *are all structured* on *one determinate* Law, such as the current quantum mechanics *is intrinsically unable* to lead to, *resolving all ambiguity!* Armed with *proof such as can satisfy an engineer conscious of the need of absolute detail*, I can assure your Grace that *relativity and the current quantum mechanics are antitheistic human inventions grossly misrepresenting the physical facts; that the world is*

non-relative and determinate! Nothing has escaped the Lord's attention! In 1985, I announced my findings to the professors! They still have not disproved them! Having been assured by people in the know that important news travels between scientists with the speed of light, I can state that those who still peddle those theories do so in full knowledge of their untruth! In full knowledge of the spiritual havoc they wreak!

4

Your Grace, what has happened since 1985 is hard to believe! The scientific community *was duly informed* about my findings from the manuscript of the *Principia Physica Universi* that I sent to them for review! *Nobody* presented a *serious* objection to the *hard facts and Logic* in it! *Ignoring* the manuscript they had read, some suggested that I try to publish *articles* on my findings! That I should *quash* the book! Which they did *not* want to see published for the *clear and argued* attribution in it of Law to God! Please note that though scientists are *never* hesitant to speak about the “law of nature” or the “law of physics”, *they have never had the courage to examine the essence, logicity and source of natural Law that remain scientifically unexplored!* I could *not* quash the book! *And they chose not to take the slightest action!* When in 1986, I published it at my own expense and sent copies to professors, societies and scientific journals for their information, comment and review, those *very few* who answered at all *were evasive even of the grave scientific issues!* Those whom I contacted by telephone *turned rude*, replying that *they felt no moral obligation* to respond to a book they had not solicited! *If* the matter were trivial, that could *perhaps* be an excuse! But *not* when the matter *is* of *such* gravity! The vast majority of them remained silent, even after repeated written requests that they act! The names of great professors, *including* Nobel laureates, and of universities on both sides of the Atlantic, make a *list of shame*, I am very sorry to say! I sent news of the findings and copies of the book to a number of priest-professors and bishop-professors who on account of their double capacity *ought to be able* to understand the crucial nature and gravity, scientific and theological, of the problem! I requested that *the Church, for the love of God and man, demand a clear and unequivocal answer on the hard scientific facts from specialist professors in great universities!* I did not receive even the driest acknowledgement! *They crowned the earlier shame!* The *visible* Church of Christ turned a *deaf* ear! Your Grace, please understand that I did *not* write before to the *few heads* of Churches! Now that I have written a second book, I am addressing *you alone* for the *greater courage the Protestant Church has exhibited in the past* in handling the great issues of God and man, *beyond the empty words to which the older Churches have accustomed us!*

Your Grace, please understand that I do *not* write to complain! From atheists, even under the priestly garments, the *Christian cannot* expect better! What makes him jump for joy makes them *bitter*! I am almost thankful, for I learned that (a), as part of God's *double* Justice, *each* man *can* judge how well *both he and others* stand by the Lord, *not* by how easily he and they *just mouth* the old clichés of a now *dubious* "faith", but by how sincerely he and they search for, and place themselves in the service of, the *final* objective for which the Lord saw fit to create the world! As this issue has *not* been addressed in the past, *it remains for the future that we must initiate*; and therefore, that the mission of Christianity *only started* with the Lord's first Coming; that even the Bible is *only an introduction* to that mission, such as the people *could* stand two thousand years ago; and that it is a *blasphemy to refuse* to take a step beyond that introduction on the belief that *it* exhausted all of God's wisdom, because that *vacates* the mission of the Holy Spirit in the world *and is part* of the *unforgivable* sin against It! The mission of the Holy Spirit *is not just to remind us of past events as stories of limited applicability*, but to make us see the *total* picture, to make us *collaborators and partners* of God in *His* work, to help Him in which He created us! Only by accepting *that* Destiny may we save our souls! This talk is *not* to the liking of people stuck to the old clichés, in them *exhausting* their "faith", remaining *faithless* for the work ahead where the *faith* is tested! Such people are *not really Christian*! And (b), as all this exposes the nakedness of those *consciously and militantly* opposing God from positions of power in this world, including especially the high positions of higher learning, they are *not* going to permit *any* news advancing His cause! So, their reaction to my first book *is proof* that in it there is *really important* material! When that book, *unique* in content, *is denied a place in the shelves of libraries while pornography is not*, though I *am* sorry, yet, *I am glad*!

5

The experience has borne fruit! I got involved in the scientific problems I described above when I started to put down thoughts on the *wider* subject of Faith and Reason, that I wanted to bring *together*, as *not* met in books. I soon realized that they both have objects; and that bringing them together meant finding the *common object they both addressed*! Which is Reality! And then I realized that Reality is *not* something fixed: Before God created anything, *He alone was all the* Reality! And after He created the world, He made Himself and it parts of the *thus widened* Reality! Who was He before? Who is He now? What is the Truth about Him? How do Reality and Truth relate? How must all these be treated as matters of Faith, and how as matters of Reason? Do Faith and Reason stand apart? How far apart do they really stand? When they come together, do

they coalesce? What does it mean to believe in Reality, Truth, Reason, the Christian Faith? Is Faith in Reality, Truth and Reason other than, apart from, Faith in God? Is Reason foreign to our Christian Faith? How does a *thinking* Christian, a scientist, an engineer, a no-nonsense man do honor to *both his simultaneous callings as an active member of this and the Other World*? The place of the scientific problem within this wider field, and that *it had to be handled first*, became apparent. As it developed, it provided the *unforeseen absolutely secure handle*, by which alone one could tackle all those other issues with confidence and authority. I restarted on the wider set of questions some five years ago; then after an interruption of two years for the needs of the flesh, I sat down to put everything together. Now I have completed a *totally new and comprehensive* logical-scientific-philosophical-theological analysis under the title of “*Reality, Truth, Faith and Reason*” (728 pages long; exclusive of Index, that I have still to put together). It is a *thorough* critical examination of our progress in civilization; that, under all the nonsense, *is the tragic struggle of the human spirit to complete itself*. Which is why, in that struggle, God has *never* been far from our thoughts—even today, when led by our teachers and those in power, *for the first time in history we make real* the Oedipodean story, engaging ourselves no longer in the unwitting but the *witting* “killing” of God, and the mad systematic demolition of values, *our seeing eyes*; in order not to see those from whom we *cannot* escape—*Him and ourselves*! No! It is *not a sad* book! It is a *fiery* book, *demolishing uncompromisingly the falsehoods* that have passed for truths! It is also my *Christian* way of getting even with all those, *left unnamed*, who, *for calculation and militant unbelief*, ignored the *binding* truths my first book disclosed, preferring to teach what *even they now know* to be pitiful falsehoods! It is a book that does *not* pull its punches! If we Christians still seek to *persuade*, *not* “convert” the world, we *must* be unflinchingly sincere first with our own “Christian” misdeeds! I *cannot* acquiesce to the fact that the Christians have become *soft* in the head, thinking Christianity to be a sentimental, toned down, always yielding to the powers of this world, no longer a true to itself confrontation of Reality! The New Testament, for all its emphasis on Love, is *not* sentimental! God’s Love is diamond clear—and diamond hard! Otherwise, it would *not* be Love, but mush! The “Christians” have made *mush* of it! The book is *controversial*, seeks to *shake* the cozy “intellectual” status quo that has *lost* direction! If we *as world* are too old to change philosophy and life, we no longer deserve to live! Those at peace with this world of *constant* compromise and devaluation of God and man shall *not* like to see the turbid waters stirred! Those, perhaps *not so few* out there, who feel as *Christians* despite the *artificial* divisions into Churches *shall rejoice* and be inspired by the stirring of waters; *shall see* that it is *not Christian* to permit the *continuing and increasing* blasphemy of God; which traditional Christianity *has allowed and not opposed*, not even see-

ing that *it does not deliver on its clearly implied promise to make this world the antechamber of the Other!* Most of the material and spirit of the book and all of its manner of handling the questions, they shall not find elsewhere!

The book I just outlined I do not even know to whom to send it for review and publication in the USA, where I know of no one sharing the agony and inspiring confidence that he will judge it as an as of yet unique product of anguished spiritual search *deserving to come to light to stir the waters*, and where a *large* segment of the publishing houses are no longer in *Christian* hands! America is a melting pot! Even theism and atheism *have melted together!* Inevitably, theism fights an *uneven* battle, as atheism has preempted for its use the separation of Church and State, *misrepresenting noisily* the spirit of the Constitution! So, *all* opinions are heard there, *except* those that stir and disturb *deeply!* People are free to believe and act as they want, as long as they do not disturb that *misunderstood* separation! How they make peace with themselves believing simultaneously opposite views remains a private affair, perhaps not too different from elsewhere in the world; where generally *very few still think deeply about anything*, and the “Christians” do not even dream of demanding a *comprehensive spiritual treatment* of current problems! As for here, where I have lived for the last three years, I have better not say a word!

As, I surely do not want to have again the problem I had the first time around, I respectfully inquire whether your Grace, or somebody whom you can unhesitatingly recommend, will be willing to review the book, already formatted page for page (and needing only minor editing, such as cross-referencing and placing the diacritical marks on Greek words). I can send it either in 3 1/2" floppy disks (formatted for the Macintosh) or hard copy. Along with a copy of the first book.

Wishing again that the Lord's Grace be always with yours,

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE: Born in Athens, 1934. Graduate of the Nat. Technical Univ. of Athens (1953-58), the Univ. of Sheffield (1961-63), the Imperial College of Science and Technology (1963-67). Postdoctoral at the Univ. of Toronto (1968-69), the Argonne Nat. Laboratory (1969-71). Senior Research Scientist at American Smelting and Refining Company, S. Plainfield, NJ (1971-84). Private Studies (1984-94). American Citizen. Books: *Principia Physica Universi*, 1986; *Reality, Truth, Faith and Reason*, 1994.

ANSWER: The following note, dated September 12, 1994 and signed by Mr. Andrew Nunn of the Public Relations Department was sent back:

Dear Dr. Stavropoulos,

The Archbishop of Canterbury has asked me to write to thank you for your letter of September 7. Dr. Carey receives an enormous quantity of unsolicited material through the post. So much, in fact, that he has to make it a rule never to undertake to read, review, or otherwise to comment upon it. I regret therefore that he will be unable to review your book for you.

I am sorry to have to send you a disappointing reply on behalf of the Archbishop.

Yours sincerely,

AUTHOR'S COMMENT: While the content of my letter speaks for itself, and in the last paragraph it is recognized that I did *not* expect the Archbishop to review the material personally if he had no time, which is certainly understandable given all his duties, an intelligent reader can only conclude that, *determined unwillingness to face the matters discussed in the letter, all pertaining to what ought to be the proper behavior of any Christian in the present times*, was hidden in the tacit *refusal to pass on for proper consideration* the material sent to the Archbishop to somebody else! The tacit refusal to see Christianity (*every part of which ought to feel anxious and obliged to respond positively to every serious offer to examine the details of important matters bearing on the common faith, on which deliberate silence is indeed negative action*), as a *united body of ever developing faith toward Perfection*, is therefore made plain through the typical lines of the reply! *No Church section may regard itself as the keeper of an ossified body of split past dogma, foreign to present developments bearing crucially on our common beliefs about eternal Reality!* The Reader will certainly draw his own conclusions.

Re: LETTER TO MR. ANT. KARKAGIANNES

ΚΑΘΗΜΕΡΙΝΗΝ
Σωκράτους 57,
Ἀθήνας, 10431

8 Νοεμβρίου 1996.

Ἀγαπητὲ Κύριε Καρκαγιάννη:

Παρακαλῶ πιστεύσατέ με λέγοντα ὅτι μάλιστα προετίμων ἂν μὴν εἶναι ἀνάγκην ἀποστείλαι ὑμῖν τὴν παροῦσαν. Ὅμως αἱ περιστάσεις ἄλλα φεῦ διατάσσουσι! Τὰ ἐν Ἑλλάδι τεκταινόμενα οὐδεμίαν περιποιοῦσι τιμὴν τῇ ἱστορίᾳ τοῦ τόπου, ὁ χρόνος κυλᾷ τοὺς ἀσυγχρονίστους καταδικάζων, ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς περὶ τὰ μὴ σπουδαῖα τυρβάζομεν, ὡς χυμῆς καθ' ἡμέραν πιστοποιεῖτε! Πολλὰ λέγονται περὶ "συνωμοσιῶν" ὑπὸ τῶν ἐδῶ κρατούντων κατὰ τοῦ τόπου. Ἀναμφιβόλως πολλοὶ πλείονες τῶν τυχόν οὕτω καὶ μὴ οὕτω δρώντων εὐθύνονται διὰ τὴν τοῦ τόπου κατάστασιν, ἐφ' ὅσον χὴ ἀπραξία, χὴ ἀποσιώπησις, χὴ πλήρης σιγή, ὅταν συνειδητῶς ἐπιλέγωνται, *καθίστανται* δράσις! Συνεπῶς, ὅλ' οἱ δυνάμενοι δράσεως συμμεριζόμεθα τὴν εὐθύνην. Ἐπελέξατε ἀσχολεῖσθαι καὶ περὶ τὰ πολιτισμικά, πολιτιστικά, ἐθνογραφικά, λαογραφικά, ὡς καὶ τὰ θεολογικά τοῦ τόπου προβλήματα. Τὸ ἐπίπεδον καὶ βάθος τῶν ἀρθρῶν οὐδενὸς σχολίου ἔχουσι χρεῖαν. Ἀναμφιβόλως, προσαρμόζετε τὰρθρα πρὸς ὃ κρίνετε εἶναι τὸ ἐπίπεδον τῶν ἀναγνώστων. Ἐξ αὐτῶν διακρίνεθ' ἡ ἀρθρογραφία τοῦ Κ. Χρ. Γιανναρά, ἥτις, ὑποψιάζομαι, ἐστὶ μᾶλλον δυσνόητος τοῖς μὴ ἔχουσι πανεπιστημιακὴν μόρφωσιν καὶ ὅμοι' αὐτῷ ἐνδιαφέροντα. Οἱ παρομοίων ἀρθρῶν λοιποὶ ἀναγνώσται διατηροῦσι μόνον τὸ ἐμφανές, εἰ καὶ μὴ ὅλως συμβατὸν πρὸς τὰ κοινῶς παραδεδεγμένα πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀρθρογράφου περὶ πατρίδος καὶ πίστεως, θεωροῦντες πάντα τὰ διὰ τῆς παραδόσεως δοθέντα ἡμῖν ὡς καλῶς ἔχοντα! Διότι φεῦ, ἡ αὐτογνωσία ἔτι ἐστὶν ὅ,τι ἀπὸ τοῦ τοῦ Πυθαγόρου καιροῦ ὁ τόπος ματαίως ζητεῖ, ἀλλ' οὐχ εὐρίσκει διότι οἱ τοῦ πνεύματος ἄνθρωποι ἀρνοῦνται ἀφιερῶν ὃν ἀπαιτεῖ χρόνον ἢ ἀναζήτησιν τῶν ἱστορικῶν βαθέων αἰτίων τῆς ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καταστάσεως! Ἄτιν' ἐστὶ τὰ μεθ' ὧν ζυμωθέντες κατεσκευάσαμεν τὸν νέον ἐθνικὸν ἡμῶν χαρακτήρα· ὃς οὐδεμίαν περιποιεῖ τιμὴν εἰς τὸ παλαιὸν ἡμῶν ὄνομα, παρ' ὅσα λέγουσιν οἱ προτιμῶντες αὐτοβραβεύεσθαι δημοσίως καὶ κολακεύειν κατὰ τὸ συμφέρον αὐτοῖς τὸν λαόν! *Οὕτως* ὁ τόπος αὐτεγκλωβίζεται καὶ ταπομονοῦται ἐπὶ μεγάλῃ ζημίᾳ τοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ λοιποῦ κόσμου παρὰ πάντων τῶν ἐνταῦθα δι' ἑαυτοὺς ἀγαθὰ προσδοκῶντων! Οὐδέ πως τῶν Ἑλλήνων οἱ πλείστοι διανοοῦνται ὅτι μείζων ἔστιν ἡ *χρεῖα ἀλλαγῆς οὐσιώδους* τῶν βαθέως ἐρριζωμένων πλὴν πολλαπλῶς *ἐσφαλμένων* ἐθνικῶν "πεποιθήσεων", ἐὰν πράγματι θέλωσιν οὐχί τιν' ἀπλοὺν ἐκσυγχρονισμόν ἀλλ' αὐτὴν

ταύτην τὴν ἐπιβίωσιν! Δοκοῦσιν ὅτι ἐπιβιώσουσιν ἄνευ ἀγῶνος, διότι "ἔχει ὁ Θεὸς τῆς Ἑλλάδος"! Ἀπλῶς βλασφημοῦσιν, εὐσεβεῖς ἑαυτοὺς θεωροῦντες! Οἱ ἐκ τῆς Δύσεως ἐπανακάμπτοντες, ἐὰν μὲν ἐκεῖ ἐγεννήθησαν, ἐκεῖ ὡς αὐτῶς καὶ ἐμορφώθησαν. Ἐὰν δ' ἀπλῶς "μετεξεπαιδεύθησαν", τῶν πλείστων *στενὴ λίαν* ὑπῆρξεν ἡ "μετεκπαίδευσις"! Πολιτισμοὶ οὐδόλως κατανοοῦνται, ἂν μὴ ἔσωθεν βιωθῶσι καὶ βραδέως μελετηθῶσιν ἕως τοῦ βάθους αὐτῶν, διὰ ταπεινώσεως, καὶ πολλῆς ἀγάπης πρὸς τὸν ἐκεῖ θεμελιώσαντ' αὐτοὺς ἄνθρωπον. Διὰ τὰς παραδόσεις ἡμῶν, ὅταν εὐρεθῶμεν ἐκτὸς, γενόμεθα ὑπερόπται ἔναντι τῶν ἄλλων πολιτισμῶν, κάρνούμεθ' ἰδεῖν τὰ ὀρώμενα, ἀποβάλλοντες τὴν αὐθόρμητον προφανῆ σύγκρισιν! Χρειαζέται πολὺς χρόνος ἵν' ὁμολογήσῃ ὁ Ἕλλην σφάλματα χαρακτήρος καὶ παραδόσεων, καὶ κρίνῃ τὰ καθορώμενα *ἀδεκάστως*! Ὅμιλῶ ἐκ προσωπικῆς πείρας!

Διὰ ταῦτα πάντα, *μικτὰ* μόνον αἰσθήματα ἔστι μοι δυνατόν ἔχειν δι' ὅ,τι ἐκ προθέσεως καλῆς ἢ κακῆς συντελεῖται ὡς καὶ δι' αὐτῶν ἔτι τῶν ἄρθρων τῶν ἐν Ἑλλάδι διανοομένων! Τοιαῦτα με παρεκίνησαν εἰς τὸ γράψαι τὸ συνημμένον, ὃ ἐλπίζω κριθήσθ' ὑπὸ τὸ φῶς τῶν ὡς ἄνω σχολίων. Περὶ τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ, οὐδόλως ἀπολογοῦμαι! Ἐλπίζω ὅτι οὐ στήσεται ὡς ἐμπόδιον! Οὐδεὶς ἔξεστιν ὑποχρεοῦν ἄνθρωπον χρῆσθαι γλώσσῃ κατωτέρᾳ τῆς ἧς δοκεῖ ἀναγκαίας, συντομωτάτης, σαφεστάτης κἀκριβεστάτης δυνατῆς αὐτῷ ἐκφράσεως σκέψεων, ἰδίως ὅτε, ἐκ τῶν δηλουμένων πραγμάτων, εἰσὶν αὐταὶ περίπλοκοι. Πρὸς δὲ τοὺς τόνους, ἡ θεία ἑλληνικὴ, καὶ τῇ μακρυνῇ ὀψει, εἰς γλώσσαν βάρβαρον μετατρέπεται ἄνευ αὐτῶν! Ἐγὼ γε *ἀρνούμαι* γράφειν τοιοῦτον ἄρθρον εἰς γλώσσαν "ἐλληνικὴν" μὲν πλὴν καὶ κατ' ὄψιν κατωτέραν τῆς γραφομένης ὑπὸ τῶν ξένων, ἐνῶ, πλέον ἔτι ἀρχαίζουσα γλώσσα ἀσφαλῶς οὐκ ἂν ἦν νῦν κατανοητὴ ὑπὸ τῶν πλείστων ἀναγνωστῶν. Πέραν τούτου, ἡ προσπάθεια ἀνῆκει ὅλη αὐτοῖς, εἴ γ' ἔτι ἐπιθυμοῦσι λογίζεσθαι Ἕλληνες! Πρὸς δὲ τὰ δηλούμενα, πολλοὺς ταῦτα δυσареστήσουσιν! Ἀλλ' ὡς οὐτ' ὁμελέττα παρασκευάζεται δι' ἀσπάστων ὧν, οὔτε μεταβολὴ πορείας ἂν τὸ σφάλμα τῆς μέχρι τοῦδε οὐ κατανοητῇ, ἀσφαλῶς σχεδὸν πλέον, χρειάζεται καὶ διὰ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν νήσων ἐμβολίσαι τὸ σκάφος τῆς τοῦ ἔθνους πορείας, ὥστε διορθοῦντες αὐτὸ ὁμοῦ δὲ καὶ τὸ πηδάλιον καὶ τὴν στρεβλὴν ἡμῶν κεφαλὴν, ἐπὶ κρείτον' ἐλπίδι ἀναχθῶμεν πρὸς στίγματα μακρυνά! Ἐπιμένω διατηρεῖν τὴν ἐλπίδα καπὶ τῶν θεμελιωδῶν ἀρχομένην ἰδεῖν τὴν λίαν καθυστερημένην συζήτησιν!

Πρὸς δὲ τὸ μῆκος τοῦ ἁρθρου, κατέστη ἀδύνατον συμπτύξαι αὐτὸ περαιτέρω ἄνευ προκλήσεως ζημίας εἰς τὰ δηλούμενα! Τὸ παρὸν Greaca font ἔστιν ὀπωσδήποτε οἰκονομικώτερον τοῦ ἐν τῇ ἐφημερίδι χρωμένου. Φωτοτοτυπικὴ μεταφορὰ ἀπαλλάξει ἡμᾶς τοῦ κόπου τῆς ἐκ νέου στοιχειοθετήσεως. Ἐὰν ἐπιμείνετε κάπορρίψετε αὐτὸ διὰ τὸ μῆκος αὐτοῦ, ἐπιτρέψατέ μοι *φιλικῶς* παρατηρῆσαι ὅτι μάλλον χῶρος πολὺς καταδαπανᾶται *κενός*, ἀσφαλῶς χάριν τοῦ style, ἐνῶ τὸ συνάλλαγμα οὐ περισσεύει οὐδὲ δι' ἄμυναν! Ἐὰν δύνωμαι διευκολύναι κατὰ τι, παρακαλῶ μὴ διστάσητε! Σχόλια καὶ ἡ κρίσις ὑμῶν ἀναμένονται!

Φιλικώτατα,

Re: ΠΕΡΙ ΟΡΘΟΔΟΞΙΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΟΛΙΤΙΣΜΟΥ

Ὡς καὶ οἱ κατὰ τὰ πατροπαράδοτα εὐσεβεῖς καὶ οἱ νεοφανεῖς ποικιλόμορφ' "ἐλληνορθόδοξοι" διατείνονθ' ὅτι "θρησκεύουν βαθύτατα", ὑπὸ τὴν παρατήρησιν τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς, ἡ δὴλωσις τοῦ κ. Χρ. Γιανναρᾶ ("Καθημερινή", 3. 11.96) ὅτι "ἡ ἐκκλ/κη ὀρθοδοξία-ὅπως καὶ κάθε κοινωνικά βιούμενη ἐμπειρία-παράγει πολιτισμό" γεννᾷ πολλὰ κρίσιμα ἐρωτήματα.

Κατ' ἀρχὴν, ἐὰν καὶ αἱ δύο αὗται δηλώσεις ὥσιν ὀρθαί, διότι οὐδεὶς σήμερον πολιτισμὸς καταφαίνεται παραγόμενος ἐν Ἑλλάδι, ἄρα παραμένει κρυφός!; Διότι τοῦτο οὐ πείθει, τοῦλάχιστον μία τῶν δηλώσεων τούτων ἔστι ψευδής καὶ πόλλ' ἀπαιτεῖται ἵνα κατανοηθῇ πλήρως ἡ οὐσία τῆς Ὀρθοδοξίας καὶ τοῦ πολιτισμοῦ ἐν συνδυασμῷ! Ἄλλως, καὶ αἱ δύο αὗται ὁμάδες ὡς καὶ πᾶν ἕτερον πολιτισμὸν δημιουργοῦν διαμέρισμα τῆς ἐλληνικῆς κοινωνίας ἀποτελοῦσιν ἀσήμαντον πλέον συνολικὴν μειονότητα! Ὅπερ προφανῶς ἔστι χεῖρον τοῦ πρώτου! Μόνοι ἄφρονες ἢ ἀνίδεοι δύνανται διατείνεσθ' ὅτι ποικίλαι γραφικότητες καὶ "ἰδιατερότητες" παντὸς εἵδους ἀποτελοῦσιν ὄντως σεβαστοὺς καὶ νομίμους πολιτισμούς (ἤτοι πέραν ὑποτυπώδους τινὸς ἐπιπέδου ἐν τῇ ἀρίστη τῶν περιπτώσεων), ὡς πονηρότατα πολλοὶ ἰσχυρίζοντ' αὐτοδικαιολογούμενοι! Δεῖ ἐν τέλει γενέσθαι κοινὴ πάντων συνείδησις ὅτι ἐνῷ τὸ τοιοῦτον κατὰ τὴν ἐμφανῆ, πονηρὰν, πρώτην αὐτοῦ λαϊκιστικὴν φάσιν ἀποβλέπει εἰς τὴν ἰσοπέδωσιν τῶν πολιτισμῶν ὥστ' οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν αἰσθάνεσθαι πολιτισμικῶς ἥσσω, εἰς τὴν ἀφανῆ, ἀνομολόγητον καὶ σατανικὴν τελευταίαν αὐτοῦ φάσιν ἀποτείνει εἰς τὴν μηδενιστικὴν ἐξαφάνισιν ὡς καὶ τῆς τῆς ιδέας τοῦ πολιτισμοῦ! Ἀλλὰ πόσοι ἀντιλαμβάνονται ὅθ' ἡ προσπάθεια αὕτη ἐλαύνετ' ἐκ προθέσεως καθαρῶς σχετικιστικῆς!;

Ὅμως, ὡς πάντες πιστεύουσιν ὅτι ὀρθῶς πιστεύουσιν εἰς ὅ,τι πιστεύουσιν ὡς ὀρθόν, τίς ὀρίζει τάντικειμενικῶς κάδιαμφισβητήτως Ὀρθόν; Προφανῶς, εἰ οὐδὲν τοιοῦτον ὑπάρχει, πάντα ἔστι σχετικὰ καὶ πᾶσα συζήτησις περὶ Ὀρθοδοξίας (ἤτοι, περὶ ἀπολύτου Ἀληθείας τε καὶ Θεοῦ) ἔστι κενή! Ὅθεν, διατίθενται οἱ "εὐσεβεῖς ἐλληνορθόδοξοι", τιμῶντες τὸ ἐαυτῶν ὄνομα, ἐγκαταλιπεῖν τὴν ὑποβόσκουσαν σχετικότητα (ἧς τὸ μέγεθος, διεισδυτικότητα καὶ σατανικότητα οἱ πλεῖστοι οὐδέ πως ὑποψιάζονται), δηλαδή, ὁμολογεῖν ἐφ' ἐξῆς Θεὸν καὶ ὑπάρχοντα καὶ μόνον ὀρίζοντα τὸ Ὀρθόν, καὶ ἵστασθαι οὕτω κριταὶ καὶ τοῦ ἔθνους καὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν, ἀνεξετάζοντες ἅμα πᾶσαν καὶ τὴν διὰ τῶν αἰώνων πορείαν καὶ τῆς "Ὀρθοδοξίας" καὶ τοῦ "πολιτισμοῦ"; Ὡς ὅτι εἴ γε οὐχί, καὶ ματαιοπονοῦσι κἀνοηταίνουσιν! Ἀντιλαμβάνονται, αὐτοὶ πρῶθ' ὅτι ἄλλως ὄντως διαινίζουσι καιρίας κακοδοξίας αἰώνων, ὧν τὰς συνεπείας ἔτι καταβάλλει καὶ καταβαλεῖ καὶ τὸ ἔθνος καὶ ὅλη ἡ ἀνθρωπότης μέχρι πλήρους ἀποπληρωμῆς;

Οἱ ἀρχαῖοι Ἕλληνες ὄντως ἔτι τιμῶνται παρ' ὧν γινώσκουσι πῶς δεῖ τιμᾶν ἀληθῶς, διότι παρὰ τὰς γνωστὰς δεινὰς ἴσων ἀδυναμίας, τοῦλάχιστον *προσεπάθουν* διὰ τοῦ Λόγου κρίνειν τὰ πρὸ αὐτῶν κείμενα! Τί οὖν ἐν συνεχείᾳ συνέβη ὥστ' ἐγκαταλειφθῆναι τὸν ἄρρενα Λόγον καὶ κυριαρχῆσαι τὸ *θῆλυ* συναίσθημα; Ὡς καὶ τὸ δράμα τὰρχαῖον, ὑπ' ἀνδρῶν ἀπὸ σκηνῆς παρουσιαζόμενον, ἀνδρικῶς τῷ θεατοῦ ἀπετείνετο Λόγῳ, *κάκεινον* ἐκάλει ἀντιμετωπίζειν τὴν ὅλην θείαν τραγικότητα τῆς ἀριστοκρατικότητος αὐτοῦ φύσεως καὶ μεταλλάξει τὴν "Μοῖραν" αὐτοῦ εἰς *Προορισμόν*! Πῶς οὖν ἄρα κατελήξαμεν εἰς τὴν *πλήρη ἀπουσίαν* τοῦ Λόγου, τὴν ἀπώλειαν τοῦ Μέτρου, τὴν ὅλως ἀναίσχυντον ἀπόσεισιν εὐθυνῶν, τὴν ἄκρως παράλογον ἄρνησιν ἐξετάσεως τῶν αἰτίων τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν προβλημάτων, τὴν ἀνανδρον παρέλκυσιν λήψεως ἀπαραιτήτων δραστικῶν διορθωτικῶν ἀποφάσεων· ὅλως θήλεα συναίσθηματα, ἐπαισχύντους γυναικείους σπαραγμούς (ὅς' ἔτι ὑπάρχουσιν ἐλληνίδες γυναῖκες ἀσφαλῶς ἐννοήσουσιν!), παντοειδεῖς ἀηδοὺς θλιβερότητος θεατρικὰς πενθίμους νοσταλγικὰς ῥητορείας, ἀσυγχωρήτους περὶ τῆς "τραγικότητος" παντὸς δυστυχήματος γυμνῶς ἐκμεταλλευτικὰς συναισθημάτων ὑπερβολὰς, δάκρυα ἀντὶ πείσμονος ἐπὶ τὰ βελτίω ἀγῶνος, χῶλως ἀνάνδρους φοβίας ἀγνώστους τοῖς Ἕλλησιν; Ἐπιδράσεις οἱ Ἕλληνες ἐδέχθησαν ἀπὸ δυσμῶν ὑπὸ τῶν Ῥωμαίων, κάπ' ἀνατολῶν ὑπὸ τῶν Περσῶν, Σημιτῶν καὶ τοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ. Ἄλλ' ὥς αἱ Ῥωμαίων ἀπὸ δυσμῶν οὐκ ἀποκλείονται, ὁ μετὰ τῶν Περσῶν συγχρωτισμὸς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἦν πάντως ὑποτυπώδης! *Σαφῆς* οὖν καθίσταται ἡ προέλευσις! Χοῦτω μόνον ἐξηγῆται τὰπὸ ἐλληνικῆς θεωρήσεως παντελῶς ἀνεξήγητον ὅτι *οὐδεμία* νῦξις ἐγένετο περὶ Λόγου κἀς αὐτὸ ἔτι τὸ τῆς "Ὀρθοδόξου" θεωρουμένης Πίστεως Σύμβολον! Τί διὰ τῶν αἰώνων συνεπήχθη διὰ τῆς *ἀκεραίως ἀνθελληνικῆς καὶ ἀντιΛογικῆς ἀπουσίας* τοῦ Λόγου (Ὀρθοῦ πάντοτε!) καὶ τῆς ἀχαλινώτου παρουσίας τοῦ κραυγαλέου πάθους ἐν Ἑλλάδι καὶ τῷ λοιπῷ κόσμῳ, θελήσουσί ποτε κατανοῆσαι χόμολογῆσαι χάριν τοῦ κοινοῦ ἡμῶν πάντων καλοῦ οἱ "ἐλληνορθόδοξοι" ἀμύντορες τῆς *ἀδιαφορίστου* βυζ/νῆς "παραδόσεως" τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν μανδύαν τοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ ἐξοβελισάντων ἀπὸ τῆς ζωῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὸν Λόγον!; Ἀσφαλῶς, οὐδεὶς ἰσχυρισθήσεται ὅτι ἦν τοῦτο θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ-Λόγου, παρακαλοῦντος ἡμᾶς *μηδέποτε* λησμονεῖν ὅτι καὶ δι' ὅλης τῆς *διανοίας* ἡμῶν *χρῆ* ἀγαπᾶν τὸν Θεόν!

Πῶς οὖν οὐ δεινῶς παραλογίζονθ' οἱ "ἐλληνορθόδοξοι" ἀπαιτοῦντες λογίξεσθ' ὥς τὸ "εἰδοποιὸν ἅλας" τῆς γῆς· δοκοῦντες ὅτι αὐτοὶ μόνοι, ὥς νῦν ἔχουσι, καλῶς ἀποτελοῦσι χύπηρετοῦσι τὸ θαυμαστὸν μετὰ χιμῶν τῶν κατ' αὐτοὺς ὅλως "ἀσυμβιβάστων" μεταξύ ἴσων Ἀνατολῆς (περιπαθῶς συναισθηματικῆς) καὶ Δύσεως (δῆθεν "λογικῆς")· ἀγνοοῦντες ὅτι οὐδὲν μετὰ χιμῶν ἀλλ' ἀγεφύρωτος ἄβυσσος ἴσταται μετὰξὺ τοῦ Λόγου, ὃν ξένον δοκοῦσιν, οὐχὶ γνησίως ἐλληνικόν, εἰς ὃν οὐδέποτε ἀναφέρονται ὥς ἡμᾶς πάντας δεῖ ἀναφέρεσθαι, καὶ τοῦ παραλογισμοῦ, οὗ τὴν αἰτίαν καὶ μέγεθος εἰσέτι οὐκ ἀπετίμησαν, τοῦ καλῶς κρυπτομένου ἐντὸς τῆς "Ὀρθοδοξίας" ἴσων λησμονοῦντες ὅτι *μόνοι* διότι οἱ *βυζ/νοὶ* ἔπαυσαν ἐλληνικῶς διὰ τοῦ αἰεὶ ζῶντος Λόγου διδάσκειν τὸν κόσμον, οὐχὶ δ' ἀπλῶς "διατηρεῖν" ὥς ἀπολιθώματα τὰ ὅσα οὐκ ἠφανίσθησαν ἀρχαῖα ἐλληνικὰ γράμματα, μᾶλλον

υπόπτως ανεπτύχθη καὶ ὁ ἑαυτῶν καὶ ὁ τῆς Δύσεως "Λόγος". ἀναγκαίως ὑπὸ τῶν ἐλλήνων νῦν ἐπανεισαγόμενος πρὸς ἀκατάληπτον χρῆσιν, θαυμαζόμενος δι' ἐπιτεύγματα, μὴ κατανοούμενος ἕως βάθους τῶν ἀποσιωπούμενων 'του, μισούμενος διὰ τὴν παγκόσμιον ἐπιβολὴν τῆς ἰσχύος 'του;

Πῶς "ὀρθοδόξως" ἐλησμονήθη τὸ "ἐκ μέρους γὰρ γινώσκουμεν καὶ προφητεύουμεν, ὅταν δ' ἔλθῃ τὸ τέλειον τὸ ἐκ μέρους καταργηθήσεται", ὥστε μὴ θεωρῆται ὑποχρέωσις σύμφυτος τῇ πίστει τοῦ 'Ορθοδόξου ἢ διαρκὴς σὺν Θεῷ ἀνεξέτασις πάσης *ἐκ μέρους φαινομένης* "'Ορθοδοξίας", ἀλλ' ἀντιθέτως ἀπ' αἰώνων θεωρῆται ὡς τέλειον καὶ αἰωνίως πεπαγιωμένον τὸ ἤδη γνωστὸν αὐτῆς σώμα; Ἄρ' ἐξηγτλήθη ἡ Σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ "πάντα ἡρευνήθη τὰ βάθη Αὐτοῦ"; *Πῶς* ἀπ' αἰώνων θεωρεῖται "Λογικὸν" καὶ "'Ορθόδοξον" τὸ πιστεύειν ξένον πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν τὸν 'Ορθὸν Λόγον; *Πῶς* ὅλως ἀνοήτως εἰς ἄλλους οἱ "ἐλληνορθόδοξοι" ἐγκατέλιπον τὸν 'Ορθὸν Λόγον, μὴ ἔχοντας μακραίωνα ἐπὶ τούτῳ θητεῖαν καὶ μαθητεῖαν, οἵτινες συνεπῶς μόνον κακέκτυπον τούτου ἐδύναντ' ἀναπαράγειν, καὶ σαθρὰ ἐπ' αὐτοῦ μόνα οἰκοδομεῖν; [*Θαυμάζουσι*, κατ' ἰδίαν ὁμολογίαν, οἱ "ἐλληνορθόδοξοι" τὴν σύγχρονον ἐπιστήμην! Διὰ τὴν *σχετικότητα* τιμῶσι τὸν Einstein! Ἄλλ' *ἀγνοοῦσι* καὶ τὰ φιλοσοφικὰ καὶ θεολογικὰ συνεπακόλουθα τῆς θεωρίας αὐτοῦ (ἅτιν' ἀπὸ δεκαετιῶν πάντως ὤφειλον γνωρίζειν καλῶς) καὶ τὸ *γεγονὸς* ὅτι ἤδη ἀπὸ δεκαετίας *κατέρρευσε*ν ἡ "ἐπιστημονικὴ ἀξία" τῆς θεωρίας αὐτῆς (ὡς *καλῶς* πλέον γνωρίζουσι ἄλλ' *ἐπιμελῶς* διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν 'των ἀποκρύπτουσι καὶ οἱ ἐδῶ "διδάσκαμοι", *συνωμοτοῦντες* μετὰ τῶν ξένων!); καὶ τὸ ὅτι ὁ Einstein ἀπλῶς ἐπεξηργάσθη "φυσικῶς" τὴν περὶ Θεοῦ-κόσμου ἀντίληψιν τοῦ Spinoza, ὃς οὐδ' *ἄπαξ* ἐν τῇ "*Ἠθικῇ*" 'του ἀνεφέρθη εἰς τὴν Δικαιοσύνην ὡς ὅρον ἢ ἔννοιαν! Γνωρίζουσιν οὖν καλῶς τί ποιοῦσιν οἱ "ἐλληνορθόδοξοι"; Ἡ μήπως αὕτη ἐστὶ πλέον ἢ ἀνομολόγητος σύγχρονος "'Ορθοδοξία", παντελῶς ξένη πρὸς τὴν Ἑλλήνων τοῦ Λόγου ἀντίληψιν, ἐφ' ὅσον περὶ τῆς Χριστιανικῆς 'Ορθοδοξίας οὐδεὶς δύναται πλέον γίνεσθαι σοβαρὸς λόγος;] *Πῶς* οὖν, δι' ἰδίων ἀδυνατοῦντες διακρίνειν οὐχὶ μόνον τὰ παλαιὰ ἀλλ' ὡς καυτὰ γε τὰ σύγχρονα ἀληθῆ καὶ ψευδῆ, ἔρχονται σήμερον "ὀρθοδόξως" γενέσθαι διαπρύσιοι θαυμασταὶ ἢ τιμηταὶ ἄλλων καὶ "συζητεῖν" *ἀδιαφορίστως* περὶ "ἐνεργητικῆς προσλήψεως καὶ παθητικῆς μιμίσεως" πραγμάτων, ὧν τὰ κακὰ ἤνεγκον τὸν κόσμον εἰς τὴν παρούσαν κατάστασιν; Ἀντιλαμβάνονται ὅλοι οἱ ἀπ' αἰώνων δημοσίως ὁμιλοῦντες καὶ γράφοντες τὴν ἐνώπιον τοῦ Λόγου βαρυτάτην εὐθύνην 'των διὰ τὰς σοφιστείας 'των, ἃς παρουσιάζουσιν ὡς σοφίαν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ, καὶ τὴν γυμνὴν προπαγάνδαν 'των ἣν διδάσκουσιν ὡς ζωῆς δίδαγμα λαῶ διὰ τῆς ὑπερόπτου πλήν ἀνομολογήτου μισαλλοδοξίας 'του καταστάντι ἀσπόνδῳ, ἀφίλῳ, τῆς ιδίας αὐτοῦ σκιᾶς περιδεεῖ, πασιδῆλως διαμείναντι ἀπαιδεύτῳ παρ' ὧν ἐπιβουλεύονται τὴν νομὴν 'του ὡς αὐτῶν ιδίου "ποιμνίου", ἀπολέσαντι τὰ ἃ ὤφειλεν εἶναι ἴδια, σὺν Θεῷ ὀρθὰ ἀπαραιτήτα πρὸς ὀρθοκρισίαν κριτήρια;

Πρὸς δὲ τὸν πολιτισμόν, *πῶς* ἀγνοεῖθ' ὅτι οὐ παράγεθ' οὗτος ὑπὸ δούλων ἢ ὑπηκόων, καὶ ἐστὶν ὅλως *ἀδύνατος* ἄνευ *συνειδητῶν πολιτῶν*; *Πῶς* ἀγνοεῖθ' ὅτι ὁ πολιτισμὸς οὐκ ἀναφέρετ' εἰς τὴν ἀδιαφόριστον πόλιν ἢ πολι-

τείαν, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ φρόνημα ἐνὸς ἐκάστου τῶν πολιτῶν ἴτης; Ποίαν τινὰ σχέσιν εἶχον οἱ πειθήνιοι βυζ/νῶν αὐτοκρατόρων ὑπήκοοι πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχαίους πολίτας; Οὐδ' εἰς αὐτὴν γε τὴν Ρώμην τῆς αὐτοκρατορικῆς ἐποχῆς ἐξέπεσον οἱ πολῖται αὐτῆς εἰς τὸ δεινὸν ἐπίπεδον τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ Βυζαντίου ἐκπηγασάντων μεσαιωνικῶν ὑπηκόων ἐλέω Θεοῦ δυναστῶν! Ἦν οὖν τόσον τέλειον τὸ βυζ/νὸν κράτος, ὥσθ' οἱ ἐφ' ἑνδεκα ὅλους αἰῶνας ἐν αὐτῷ ἄνευ πολιτικῶν δικαιωμάτων διατελέσαντες δικαίως θεωρεῖν ἑαυτοὺς πανευτυχεῖς, καὶ περιττὴν πᾶσαν περὶ τὰ πολιτικά καὶ πολιτισμικά πρόοδον τῆς κοινωνίας αὐτῶν; Ἐπερχόμενοι πολιτισμοὶ ἄξιοι τοῦ ὀνόματος οὐ καταστρέφουσι τοὺς πρὸ αὐτῶν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ κείνων ἑαυτοὺς οἰκοδομοῦσι καλλίονας! Δύναθ' ἴστασθ' ἰσχυρισμὸς ὅτι ἐπὶ τὰρχαίου πολιτισμοῦ, οὐχὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐρειπίων ἑαυτοῦ, εἰς ἃ κατέπεσεν ὑπὸ τὰμέτρητα βάρβαρα πλήγματα τῶν βυζ/νῶν "χριστιανῶν", ὠκοδομήθη ὁ βυζ/νός; Οὐκ εἰς ἄσβεστον μετέτρεψαν οἱ βυζ/νοὶ τὰ δι' ἔρωτος τελειότητος λελαξευμέν' ἀρχαῖα ἀγάλματα; Ἡ μήπως οὐκ ἦσαν ἐκείνων ἄξεστ' ἀπόγον' οἱ ἀντὶ μισθοῦ τεμαχίσαντες κάπὶ ξένων πλοίων φορτώσαντες τὰ "Ελγίνεια", ὥς καὶ οἱ νῦν ἐπὶ χρήμασι καπηλεύοντες τὴν ὀλίγην ἐναπομείναν κληρονομίαν; Τί κοινὸν οὗτοι μετὰ τῶν ἀρχαίων πολιτῶν εἶχον, τῶν οἰκοδομησάντων ἀνυπερβλήτως λαμπρότατον τὸν ὑπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων καταστραφέντα πρῶτον ἐπὶ γῆς ναὸν ἀφιερωμένον εἰς τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν-Θεονόην Θεοῦ-Λόγου Σοφίαν; Εἰ μικρὸν μόλις κλάσμα τῆς ἀρχαίας γραμματείας περιεσώθη, οὐκ ὀφείλεται τοῦτο εἰς μόνην τὴν ἀδιαφορίαν τῶν βυζ/νῶν, ὧν ὀλίγοι καὶ μόνον διέσωσαν ὅσα ἐδυνήθησαν διασῶσαι, καθὼς ὀλίγοι μόνον αὐτῶν ἐνδιεφέρθησαν ἀληθῶς περὶ γραμμάτων καὶ ἐπιστημῶν, τῶν λοιπῶν καὶ πολλῶν μόνων καταλιπόντων ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ περὶ τὴν γλῶσσαν ἀληθῶς μέγα πρόβλημα καὶ τὸ συνακόλουθον πλὴν ἀνομολόγητον αἰεὶ ὑποβόσκον μῖσος τῶν ἀγραμμάτων κάκαλλιεργήτων πρὸς τὰ "πολλὰ γράμματα", ἅπερ φοβοῦνται καὶ πανεπιστημίων γιγνόμενοι φοιτηταί, ἀπαιτοῦντες ἐν ἀνὰ μάθημα μόνον βιβλίον (καὶ τοῦτο σύρραμμα μᾶλλον ἢ σύγραμμα!) κατάλληλον πρὸς εὐκόλον ἀποστήθισιν ἢ βαθεῖαν μελέτην; Πότε καὶ τί ἤκουσέ τις περὶ καθολικῆς ἢ δημοσίας παιδείας ἐν Βυζαντίῳ; Δύναθ' ὑπάρξαι ποιά τις σύγκρισις τοῦ εὖρους, βάθους, ποιότητος καὶ ποσότητος τὰρχαίου καὶ τοῦ βυζ/νοῦ πολιτισμοῦ; Ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὀμήρου μέχρις ἰδρύσεως τῆς Κων/λεως παρήλθον περὶ τὰ χίλια ἑκατὸν ἔτη. Μέχρι δὲ τῆς Ἀλώσεως ὡς ἀκριβῶς ἄλλα τόσα. Τὰ πράγματα, τὰ ἐρείπια, ἡ ἔλλειψις μνημείων καὶ ἐρειπίων, ἡ πολιτισμικὴ καταλειφθεῖσα κληρονομία ὁμιλοῦσιν ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν πλὴν ἠθελημένως τυφλοῖς! Οἱ "ἐλληνορθόδοξοι" ὅμως τρέμουσι τὴν ὑπόμνησιν καὶ τὴν σύγκρισιν, φοβούμενοι μήπως τυχὸν βλασφημήσωσιν! Ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ βλασφημοῦσιν, ἐκ Θεοῦ θεωροῦντες καὶ ὑπαινισσόμενοι τὴν μεσαιωνικὴν πολιτισμικὴν ἀναστροφήν, τὴν διαπραχθεῖσαν ὑπὸ τὰς εὐλογίας τῆς βυζ/νῆς "Ἐκκλησίας", ἡ ὁποία φέρει ἀκέραιον τῆς εὐθύνης τὸ βάρος! Δέον, ἐπὶ τέλους, διαχωρίζειν τὴν "Ἐκκλησίαν" (ὡς καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν ὡς "Ὀρθόδοξον" φερομένην) ἀφ' ἧς ὁ Θεὸς γνωρίζει ὡς Ἐκκλησίαν Του! Ὑπερδῆρκεσεν ὁ σφετερισμός! Καὶ σοβαρῶς ἀμφιβάλλειν ὀφείλομεν ὅτι ἡ ἐπίσημος "Ἐκκλησία" ἦν ποτε ὡς σὺν Θεῷ ἐπιθυμοῦμεν αὐτήν! Οἱ ὀλίγοι ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀναγνωρισθέντες ἄγιοι ἀδυνατοῦσιν ἀπαλλάξαι τῆς εὐθύνης τὴν φαινομένην ὡς "Ἐκκλησίαν"

διὰ τὸ πολιτισμικὸν αὐτῆς ἔγκλημα, καὶ τὴν παρ' αὐτῆς παραγωγὴν "πιστῶν" μᾶλλον ἢ ἐλευθέρων πολιτῶν ἐργατῶν, εἰς τὴν ἀποκλειστικὴν ὦν φροντίδα ὁ Θεὸς ἐναπέθηκε τὴν λύσιν τῶν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἀφορώντων προβλημάτων τοῦ κόσμου, κατὰ τὸ ἡμῶν δυνατόν! Ἄλλ' ἢ ἐπίσημος "Ἐκκλησία" πάντοτε περὶ ποιμνίων ὠμίλησεν, οὐδέποτε περὶ ἐλευθέρων πολιτῶν ἐργατῶν! Τυχαῖον; Μὴν ἀστειεύεσθε! Ἐνταῦθα κρίνεθ' αὐτὴ ἢ κατάληξις τῆς ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου προσπαθείας Θεοῦ καὶ Ἀνθρώπου! Ἱερὰ οὖν ἡ βάτος· ἐν ἧ καλὸν σοι μὴ παίζειν! Ἡ νεοελληνικὴ φυγοπονία χηρὴ πείσμων ἐπαρχιωτικῇ ἀντίληψις περὶ κόσμου τῶν συγχρόνων ἐλλήνων, ἀποτελοῦσαι φεῦ ἀναπόσπαστον τμήμα τῶν "ὀρθοδόξων πολιτιστικῶν καταβολῶν" καὶ οὕτως ἐπίσης νῦν "δικαιολογούμεναι" "ἐλληνορθόδοξως" ὡς μέρος τῆς μιᾶς τῶν δύο "ἀσυμβάτων ὀντολογιῶν" καὶ "ἀντιθετικῶν νοσηματοδοτήσεων" ὑπάρξεως, κόσμου καὶ βίου, ἀλλὰ μὴ (παρὰ τάντιθέτως δοκούμενον) συνιστῶσαι "ἀντίπαλον πολιτισμὸν" πρὸς τὴν *πρακτικὴν* φιλοπονίαν τῶν δυτικῶν (ἧς ἕνεκα οὗτοι θεωροῦνται παρ' ἡμῶν "σκληροὶ καὶ ψυχροί"), ἀσφαλῶς οὐκ ἔσχεν ἀρχαίαν, ἀλλὰ *μεσαιωνικὴν* τὴν προέλευσιν! Οὔτε ἡ Ρώμη, οὔτε ὁλος ὁ ἀρχαῖος πολιτισμὸς ἐκτίσθησαν εἰκὴ καὶ ὡς ἔτυχον, ὡς αἰσχροῦς κάπιπολαίως οἱ νεοέλληνες κτίζουσιν! Ὁ δὲ ὄγκος καὶ ἡ ποιότης τῶν πολιτισμῶν ὁμιλοῦσι κατὰ τόμους ἀναριθμήτους τῷ δυναμένῳ ἀναγιγνώσκειν περὶ τῆς φιλοπονίας καὶ φυγοπονίας τῶν ἐποχῶν! Ἀληθῶς ἠγάπησεν ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς μεσαιωνικοὺς πλέον τῶν ἀρχαίων; Διὰ τὸ (πολὺ) "Κύρι' ἐλέησον"; Διὰ τὴν *λόγῳ μαλακῶν χειλέων* μᾶλλον ἢ *ἔργῳ σκληρῶν χειρῶν* λατρείαν ἑκείνων τοῦ "ἀεὶ ἐργαζομένου Πατρός"; Ἀπαγε τῆς βλασφημίας τοῦ θεωρεῖν τὸν Θεὸν ἀρεσκόμενον εἰς δοξολογίας καὶ ἐπικλίσεις κενάς, ἢ ἔργα ἐπίπονα, μεγάλα, αἰώνια καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρωπίνως δυνατόν! Ἡμήπως αὐτὴ ἡ πρωτοφανὴς εἰς τὴν παγκόσμιον ἱστορίαν πολιτισμικὴ ἀναστροφή ἐπετεύχθη διὰ *δεινῆς, οὐδέποθ' ὁμολογηθείσης* πνευματικῆς καταπίεσεως, τῆς "Ἐκκλησίας" ἐν ταύτῃ προστησάσης;

Αὐταὶ οὖν εἰσιν αἱ δύο παραδόσεις τῶν νεοελλήνων!: Ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν παραπαίουσι μέχρι παραφροσύνης· ὑπὸ σειρῆνων ἔνθεν κάκειθεν καλούμενοι τῇδε κάκεισε ὁδεύειν· ἀδυνατοῦντες διὰ τὴν μακραίων ἀπαιδευσίαν ἑκείνων ἐπιλέξαι τίνων ἑαυτοὺς θέλουσιν εἶναι υἱοὺς: *ἐλευθέρων* (καὶ διὰ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἑκείνων, *πλήρως ὑπευθύνων!*) *πολιτῶν*, ἢ αὐθεντῶν *ὑπήκων* (καὶ διὰ τοῦτ' *ἀνορθόδοξως* ἑαυτοὺς θεωρούντων εὐθυνῶν ἐλευθέρους!), οὐδένοσ περὶ τῆς αὐτῶν ἐλευθερίας δικαιούμενοι λόγον; Ταῦτα ἐνῶ οἱ σύγχρον' "ἐλληνορθόδοξοι", ἄνθρωποι μαλακοί, τοῦ ἀγίου ἡρωικοῦ ἐλληνικοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιλήσμονες, ὡς κάπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἱεροῦ θυμοῦ λιποτακτοῦντες, πάντοτ' ἐπὶ θεωρίας ἀναλισκόμενοι, ἐπὶ τοῦ γε νῦν ἐπ' ἄριστα πρακτέου ἀνίδεοι, *ἀδυνατοῦσιν* ὁδηγῆσαι αὐτοὺς δι' ἄλλων πλὴν *δυσλήπτων, ἀχρήστων, εἰ κούχι ἄκρως ἐπικινδύνων* πλατεiasμῶν!

Ἀντιλαμβάνονται, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁμολογοῦσιν ὅτι, ἡ μετάστασις τῆς ὑπηκοότητος ἀπὸ τοῦ βυζ/νοῦ αὐτοκράτορος εἰς τὸν τοῦρκον σουλτάνον ἦν καὶ πολιτικῶς διὰ πάντας τοὺς ὑπηκόους, καὶ πολιτισμικῶς διὰ τοὺς πλείστους αὐτῶν *ἀδιάφορος*! Οὐδ' ὅτι κατασφυοφαντοῦσι τοὺς Τούρκους διὰ τὸ περι-

πεσεῖν αὐτῶν εἰς τὴν ὑπὸ κείνους δουλείαν (διὰ ἣν *μόνοι* οἱ *βυζ/νοί* ἔτων πατέρες ἦσαν ὑπεύθυνοι!), ἀποδιδόντες τοῖς Τούρκοις τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ Βυζαντίου *εὐθέως* κληρονομηθεῖσαν πνευματικὴν ἀφασίαν καὶ μῖσος πρὸς ὅ,τι γενναίως ὠραῖον, ἐλληνικόν! Οὐδ' ὅτι *μόνον* διὰ τὴν κατὰ Θεοῦ βλάσφημον *ἐλλειψιν* πολιτῶν *δικαίως* κατέπεσε τὸ Βυζάντιον· διότι *οὐδέποτ'* ἠθέλησεν ὁ Θεὸς δούλους τοὺς πολίτας αὐτοῦ, μισθοῦντας δὲ ξένους στρατιώτας πρὸς προστασίαν, οὐδέ γε δούλον, ὑπήκοον, ἢ ἄβουλον "πρόβατον" τὸν εἰς Αὐτὸν πιστεύοντ' εἰ καὶ μὴ πιστεύοντ' ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ *Φίλον*, καὶ διὰ τοῦθ' ὑπευθύνως ἐλεύθερον κἂν αὐτῇ τῇ ζωῇ, ὥστε *πλήρως* κατὰ *τάνθρώπινον* ἡ-τοιμασμένον ὑποδεχθῇ αὐτὸν ὡς ἄξιον καὶ τῆς Ἄνω Πολιτείας Πολίτην! Ἀλλὰ τί περὶ τούτων ἠκούσθη ποτὲ ὑπὸ τῶν "ἐλληνορθόδοξως" ἀπ' αἰῶνων δημαγωγούντων; Πῶς οὖν μὴ σήμερον παραπαίειν οἱ Ἕλληνες· διὰ τὸν ἀκατάσχετον φόβον ὡς καὶ τῆς τῆς ἐλευθερίας σκιάς, οὐχὶ διὰ τὴν κατὰ πάντ' ἀμοιβαίως *Λογικὴν* ἀγάπην Θεοῦ καὶ Ἀνθρώπου, φοβούμενοι ἀποβάλλειν τὴν *βυζ/νὴν* ὑποτέλειαν· καὶ διὰ τὴν οὕτω ἀπ' αἰῶνων καλλιεργηθεῖσαν *παλαιοασιατικὴν* κυρίως πνευματικὴν ὀκνηρίαν, ἀρνούμενοι ἀναλαβεῖν ἀκεραίως τὸ *πνευματικὸν* χρέος τοῦ συγχρόνου πολιτισμοῦ, ἐνοποιούντος τὸν κόσμον καὶ οὕτως ἐτοιμάζοντος τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς Κρίσεως διὰ τῆς καταγνώσεως τῶν κοινῶν καὶ δι' ὅλους *ἐνιαίως* πνευματικῶν προβλημάτων; Διατείνονται ἀναγκαίαν πρὸς τὴν διάδοσιν τοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ τὴν ὑπαρξίν τῆς ποτε Ρωμαϊκῆς αὐτοκρατορίας! Ἀλλ' ὅτε ἡ φροντίς αὐτῆς περιῆλθεν εἰς τοὺς *βυζ/νοὺς* ἔτων πατέρας, ἐκεῖνοι μὲν τότε δι' ἀδιαφορίαν, νωχέλειαν καὶ μικρόνοιαν ἐλάχιστα ἔπραξαν ὥστε ἐνιαίον τηρῆσαι τὸ κράτος διὰ τὴν αὐτὴν γε ἀνάγκην, ἐκείνων δὲ σήμερον οἱ υἱοὶ λυσσαλέως ἀντιμάχονται τὴν ἑτέραν ὡσαύτως ἀνάγκην τῆς ἀπὸ κοινοῦ ἐτοιμασίας τῆς Κρίσεως τοῦ *ἐνὸς* ὄντως κόσμου τῆς γῆς, λησμονοῦντες, οἱ "εὐσεβεῖς", τὸ "κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολέσει καὶ τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ἄλλοις ἐκδώσεται γεωργοῖς"!

Ἡ κυρία διαφορὰ μεταξὺ "Ὀρθοδοξίας" καὶ Δύσεως ἔγκειται εἰς τὴν *παρ' ἀμφοτέρων ἐσφαλμένην* ἀποτίμησιν τῆς σχέσεως τοῦ *ἀτόμου* πολίτου πρὸς τὴν κοινωνίαν-ἐκκλησίαν, πολιτείαν-κράτος, καὶ τὴν μετὰ τὴν Κρίσιν ἐν Οὐρανοῖς Πολιτείαν! Πατροπαραδότως ἀλλ' οὐχὶ βεβαίως κατὰ θεῖαν ἐπιταγὴν, καὶ ἡ ἀνατολικὴ καὶ ἡ δυτικὴ "Ἐκκλησία" εἰς ἑαυτὰς πάντοτ' ἐπεδίκασαν τὰ πόλυτα δικαιώματα (π.χ., ποῦ ἐν αὐταῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ *Λαοῦ* τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκλέγονται οἱ "ποιμένες" αὐτοῦ;), εἰς τὰ ἴδι' αὐτῶν κατὰ κόσμον συμφέροντα ὑπέταξαν (καὶ περιεφρόνησαν) τὸν ἄτομον πολίτην, καὶ τὸν αἰεὶ ἐπεζήτησαν μεταποιῆσαι εἰς "πιστόν", ἥτοι, *πλήρη ὑπήκοον* καὶ τῆς "Ἐκκλησίας" καὶ τῆς *κοσμικῆς* πολιτείας· ὑπισχνόμεναι τὴν ψυχῆς σωτηρίαν διὰ τῶν τοῖς πᾶσι γνωστῶν ἐκκλ/κῶν μεθόδων καὶ μέσων. *Οὐδέποτε* διηρωτήθησαν μήπως *ἄλλα καὶ πολλὰ πλείονα δικαίως* ἀπαιτεῖ ὁ *τέλειος* Θεὸς ἀπὸ τῶν *συνειδητῶν* Πολιτῶν-Φίλων Ἐκείνου, οὐχὶ *ὅσα εὐκόλα* πρεσβεύουσιν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἐν τῇ προσπαθείᾳ ἔτων δημιουργῆσαι περὶ ἑαυτοὺς *πειθήνια* "ποιμνία"! Μᾶλλον ἐσκεμμένως, εἰδάλλως διὰ μόνην τὴν ἀνοησίαν, οἱ "ἐλληνορθόδοξοι" ἐξακολουθοῦσιν ἀγνοεῖν τὰς *κολοσσιαίας* εὐθύνas τοῦ *βυζ/νοῦ* κράτους διὰ τὴν ἐξέλιξιν ἀκολουθήσαντος παγκοσμίου πολιτισμοῦ: Ἐνῷ οἱ

Ῥωμαῖοι ἔχυσαν ποταμούς τοῦ ἰδίου αὐτῶν αἵματος ἵνα διατηρήσωσιν ἐν-
αἶον τὸ κράτος, χάριν βεβαίως τοῦ πολιτισμοῦ, οὐχὶ τοῦ (συνεχῶς δαπανη-
ροτέρου) ὑλικοῦ ὀφέλους, ὅτε φεῦ ἡ φροντίς αὐτοῦ περιῆλθεν εἰς τὰς χεῖρας
τῶν πολιτικῶς ἀεὶ ἀνικάνων Ἑλλήνων, πάντων πλὴν τοῦ Μεγάλου Ἀλεξάν-
δρου (καὶ παρὰ τὴν ὑπὸ κείνου κακῶς ἐπιδιωχθεῖσαν ἐπὶ τοῦ κόσμου κυριαρ-
χίαν!) ὅλως ἐπαρχιωτικὴν, ὑπὸ τὴν *χειρίστην* αὐτῆς ἔννοιαν, μικροπολιτι-
κὴν μετελθόντων καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὐδέποτ' εἰς *ἐν σύνολον* κράτος ἑαυτοὺς
ένωσάντων), οὗτοι τὰς μὲν δυτικὰς ἐπαρχίας ἐγκατέλιπον πλήρως τὰς δ'
ἀνατολικὰς παρημέλησαν σταθερῶς μέχρι τῆς Πτώσεως! Ἐξ αὐτῆς κυρίως
τῆς αἰτίας ἠύρεθη ἡ Δυτ. "Ἐκκλησία" εἰς τὴν θέσιν καὶ τοῦ κοσμικοῦ ἄρ-
χοντος! Ἀλλ' ἐνῶ εἰς τὴν Δύσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εὐρεθέντες ἐνώπιον τῆς φοβε-
ρᾶς διαφθορᾶς τῆς ὑπερπολιτείας-ἐκκλησίας ἀπετίναξαν κάποτε τὸν τῆς
"ἐκκλησίας" ζυγόν, ἀλλ' οὐδέποτε *φιλοσοφικῶς* περὶ τὰ θεῖα διδαχθέντες
ἀπέβαλον ἐν πολλοῖς (ὡς οὐκ ὤφειλον) καὶ τὴν εἰς Θεὸν πίστιν, δοκῆσαντες
αὐτὴν μόνον ὡς πρόσχημα, ἀλλὰ πάντως πεισθέντες περὶ τῆς ἀναγκαιότη-
τος τῆς καλῆς λειτουργίας τῆς ἐπὶ γῆς πολιτείας (ἥς τὴν ὑπηρεσίαν ἀνῆ-
γαγον εἰς θρησκείας ὑποκατάστατον) ὠργάνωσαν ἐν τέλει τὰς πολιτείας
ἑαυτῶν ὑπηρετεῖν τὸν *ἄτομον* πολίτην (μόνην ἐναπομείνανσαν φυσικὴν-ἠθικὴν
ὄντοτητα)· ἀντιθέτως, εἰς τὴν Ἀνατολὴν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εὐρεθέντες ἀφ' ἐνὸς
πρὸ τοῦ *φαινομένου* δυϊσμοῦ πολιτείας-ἐκκλησίας κάφ' ἑτέρου τῆς *ἠθελη-
μένης* (ἐλληνικῶς δ' ὅλως ἀχαρακτηρίστου κάσυχωρήτου) *ἀρνήσεως* τῶν
ικανοτέρων ἐξ αὐτῶν ὅπως σκέπτονται *φιλοσοφικῶς* (ὑπὸ τὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ Σω-
κράτους διδαχθεῖσαν διάθεσιν πρὸς τὴν *δεῖ μίαν Ἀλήθειαν*) ἐπὶ τῶν σχέ-
σεων ἀτόμων πολιτῶν, κοινωνίας, ἐκκλησίας, πολιτείας, Πολιτείας καὶ τῶν
προβλημάτων περὶ αὐτῶν, παρεδόθησαν *πνευματικῶς ἀμαχητὶ* εἰς τὴν ὑπὸ
τῆς "Ἐκκλησίας" ἐπιβληθεῖσαν φιλοσοφικὴν *ἀπραξίαν*, χάριν τῆς ἀποφυγῆς
νέων αἱρέσεων καὶ σχισμάτων, εἰς ἃ ὁδηγεῖ (ἐν κοινωνίαις ἀγομέναις ὑπὸ
φανατικῶν πλὴν *ἡμιμαθῶν, ὡς ἐπ' ἄριστα*, ἱερωμένων καὶ "Θεολόγων") πᾶσα
περὶ τῶν παρόντων καὶ θεῶν συζήτησις μεταξὺ ἀνθρώπων ἐπιζητούντων
μὲν τὴν ἑαυτῶν ψυχὴν σῶσαι, οὐχὶ ὅμως δὲ καὶ ἐγκαταλείποντων ἑαυτοὺς
τῷ Θεῷ ἱκανῶς καὶ δικαίως κρινεῖν τὴν τῶν συζητούντων εὐθύτητα, εἰλικρί-
νειαν, κάγαθὴν πρόθεσιν, ὑπὲρ τὴν δυνατὴν πλὴν ἀθέλητον ἁμαρτίαν ἑαυτῶν!
Ἀλλ' οὕτως ἐγένετο ὁ "πολίτης" ἔτι ταπεινότερος τοῦ ὅλου, τῆς κοινωνίας,
τῆς "Ἐκκλησίας", τοῦ κράτους *ὑπήκοος* ὥν τὰς εἰς ἔπακρον καταστροφι-
κὰς συνεπείας νῦν ζῶμεν!

Ἀλλὰ πρέπει οἱ Ὀρθόδοξοι ἀποφεύγειν *φοβούμενοι* τὴν συζήτησιν, λη-
σμονοῦντες ὅτι καὶ "αἱ αἱρέσεις *χρὴ ἔρχεσθαι*", προφανῶς ἵν' ἀποκαθαρθῇ ἡ
Ἀλήθεια; Ἡ μήπως περὶ τὴν "Ἐκκλησίαν" ἐνδιαφέρεται ὁ Θεὸς μᾶλλον, ἢ
τὴν *ἐκάστου* ἀτόμου ἀνθρώπου ψυχὴν; Πῶς οὖν *ἀσπόνδυλον τοῦτον* κατέ-
στησαν, θεῖα δὴθεν ἐπιταγὴ; *Οἱ ἐγωισμοὶ καὶ μεσαιωνικοὶ φόβοι, οὐχὶ ἡ*
ἐπιθυμία καὶ διὰ τῶν φιλοσοφικῶν ἀναζητήσεων ἀποδοῦν' ἔτι πληρεστέραν
τῷ Θεῷ δόξαν, ὠδήγουν, ἐν τῇ οὐσίᾳ, τοὺς βυζ/νοὺς εἰς πάσας τὰς πνευμα-
τικὰς ἑαυτῶν δραστηριότητας! Διὰ τοῦτ' ἐγκατέλιπον τὸν ἀρχαῖον πολιτι-
σμόν, καταστυγοφαντήσαντες αὐτὸν καπὸ κείνου ἐλάχιστα διασώσαντες
μᾶλλον ἢ ἐπὶ κείνου, ὡς πολιτισμικῶς ὤφειλον, οἰκοδομήσαντες τὸν ἴδιον

ἐαυτῶν! Ἐφ' ὧν τὰ ἴχνη κατὰ τὸ πλεῖστον βαδίζουσι καὶ οἱ διάφοροι σημε-
ρινοὶ "ἐλληνορθόδοξοι"! Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μέχρι τοῦ νῦν οἱ δυτικοὶ ἀποδείκνυν-
ται ἀπλῶς πλὴν δικαίως καλλίονες, οὐχὶ ἄριστοι, συνεχιστὰι τάρχαίου
πνεύματος, ἢ οἱ φυσικοὶ αὐτοῦ κληρονόμοι, οἱ ὅποιοι δεινῶς ἔτι διχάζον-
ται μεταξὺ τῶν δύο τούτων κληρονομιῶν· ἀδυνατοῦντες συνθεῖναι, λίαν
ἔστω ὀψίμως, τὴν ἣν ὤφειλεν εἶναι μίαν, φυσικὴν, ἀδιάσπαστον κάδιαίρε-
τον ἀπὸ τάρχαίου ἐλληνικοῦ εἰς τὸν ἀκολουθήσαντα χριστιανικὸν κόσμον
μετάβασιν· ἀναλίσκόμενοι φεῦ περὶ ἀνθρώπων ἐγωισμοὺς κατεχομένων ὑπὸ
μικρονοίας ἀσυγχωρήτου φιλοσόφων υἱοῖς, ἀνθρώπων μικρῶν, κενῶν κἀσέ-
μνως κενοδοξούντων ἐπὶ μεγάλα, ἀναλίσκομένων περὶ ἐπαισχύντους μικρό-
τητας, ταπεινοὺς ὑπολογισμοὺς, ἀκόρεστον χρηματισμόν, πάθη ἀβυσσαλέα,
μίση ἀσίγητα, φόβους καὶ δειλίαν ξένην τοῖς Ἑλλησιν· ἅτινα μετὰ τῆς εἰς
Θεὸν ἀπιστίας κάπουσίας γνησίας φιλοσοφίας, καὶ ἐλλείψεως μεγαλοφρο-
σύνης, ἀρετῆς, γενναιότητος, ἀναπληρουμένων ὑπὸ περισσείας κενῆς ὑπερ-
οψίας καταφανοῦς οὔσης τῆς ἐνδεείας τεθησαυρισμένης προσωπικῆς ταπει-
νότητος ὑπὸ τῶν φαινομένων σπουδαίων συντιθέασι τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ νέου ἐλ-
ληνικοῦ κράτους, "πολιτισμοῦ", "Ἐκκλησίας" καὶ πάσης τῆς ἐνταῦθα "πνευ-
ματικῆς ἡγεσίας"!

Χωρὶς αὐτῶν πάντων τὴν συνείδησιν καὶ διόρθωσιν, πᾶσα ἐτέρα "συζή-
τησις" μόνην τὴν κενότητ' ἀποδείκνυσιν τῶν, οὕτω, κενὰ "συζητούντων", καὶ
περαιτέρω ἐπιβραδύνει τὴν ἀναστολὴν τῆς ἐπὶ τὸ μηδὲν πορείας τοῦ τό-
που· εἴ τις ἔτι περὶ ταύτην ἔστι καιρὸς!

Re: ΠΕΡΙ ΖΩΗΣ ΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΒΙΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΤΟΥΤΩΝ ΝΟΗΜΑΤΟΣ

Κύριον Χρήστον Γιανναρᾶν
Πλαστήρα 84, Νέαν Σμύρνην
Ἀθήνας, 17121

23 Νοεμβρίου 1996.

Ἀγαπητὲ Κύριε Γιανναρᾶ:

Ἡ χθεσινοβραδυνὴ εἰς τὴν περὶ εὐθανασίας συζήτησιν ὑμετέρα παρέμβασις καθ' ἣν ὠμιλήσατε περὶ τάπαιτουμένου σεβασμοῦ ἔνωπιον τοῦ πόνου καὶ τοῦ θανάτου, καὶ τῆς "νοηματοδοτήσεως" ὧν (ἐκφράσεως λίαν προσφιλοῦς εἰς ὑμᾶς), προεκάλεσε ἐν ἐμοὶ σκέψεις ὡς ἀκολουθῶς ἂς ἴσως εὐρήσεται ἔνδιαφερούσας:

1. Κατ' ἀρχὴν διερωτᾶται: Ἐὰν ἐνδιαφέρει ποσῶς ἡ ὑφ' ἡμῶν πάντως τυχοῦσα καὐθαίρετος "νοηματοδότησις" ἢ πολὺ μᾶλλον ἡ ἀνακάλυψις τοῦ ἐγγενῶς τοῖς πράγμασιν ὑπάρχοντος γνησίου νοήματος; Διὰ τοῦ πρώτου, ἕκαστος ἐλεύθερον ἐν παντὶ ἑαυτὸν αἰσθανόμενος δίδωσι τοῖς πράγμασι τὸ εἰς αὐτὸν ἀρεστόν "νόημα": καὶ οὐδεμία ὑπάρχει πρακτικὴ δυνατότης ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ νόημα πάντας συγκλίνειν! Διὰ τοῦ δευτέρου ἕκαστος ἀναγνωρίζει τὴν ἀναμφισβήτητον ἀντικειμενικότητα τῶν πραγμάτων, διατάσσουσιν τὸ ἐγγενὲς νόημα ἐνὸς ἑκάστου αὐτῶν καὶ πάντες συγκλίνουνσι, τοῦτο ἀναγνωρίζοντες, πρὸς τὸ αὐτὸ ἐν ἀληθὲς νόημα! Σαφὲς οὖν ὅτι ἐνῶ κατὰ τὴν πρώτην περίπτωσιν ἐστὶ τοῦλάχιστον δυσκολώτατον εἰ οὐχὶ πλήρως ἀδύνατον φυγεῖν ἀπὸ παντὸς συναισθηματισμοῦ, κατὰ τὴν δευτέραν πᾶς συναισθηματισμὸς ἀποκλείεται ὡς μὴ τοῖς ἀντικειμενικοῖς πράγμασιν ἐγγενὴς καὶ πάντες ἀναγκάζονται λογικεύεσθαι! Ἡ διαφορὰ ἐστὶν ἐμφανής! Δεδομένης δὲ τῆς ἀληθῶς ἀηδιαστικῆς συναισθηματικότητος τῶν νεοελλήνων (ἥτις τόσα φοβερὰ προβλήματα προκαλεῖ καὶ συντηρεῖ εἰς τὸν τόπον) προστιθεμένης ἐπὶ τῆς ὑγιοῦς τοιαύτης πάντων τῶν ἀνθρώπων πρὸ τοῦ προβλήματος τοῦ θανάτου προσφιλῶν ὧν προσώπων, ἐπιτρέψατέ μοι παρατηρήσαι ὅτι ὡς καὶ τὸς ὁ φωνῆς τόνος παντὸς δημοσίως περὶ αὐτὰ ὁμιλοῦντος δέει τείνειν οὐδετέρως πρὸς τὴν ἀντικειμενικότητα!

2. Τὰ ὑφ' ὑμῶν λεχθέντα περὶ τοῦ θανάτου, τὰπολύτου πρὸς τὴν ζωὴν σεβασμοῦ καὶ τῆς "νοηματοδοτήσεως τοῦ πόνου" ὠδήγησαν διὰ τοῦ τῆς ὑμετέρας φωνῆς τόνου εἰς τὸ συμπέρασμα τῆς ἀπολύτου ὑμετέρας ἐναντιώσεως πρὸς πᾶσαν ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐθανασίας ιδέαν. Ἀλλ' ἐὰν πράγματι ὡς Χριστιανοὶ καὶ δὴ Ὁρθόδοξοι ὑποχρεούμεθα "νοηματοδοτῆσαι τὸν πόνον", ἄρα

λογικῶς δέομεν ἴστασθαι *συνεπεῖς γενικῶς* ὥστε "νοηματοδοτεῖν" πάντα πόνον, μείζονα ἢ ἐλάσσονα, φυσικὸν ἢ ψυχικόν! "Ἄν λοιπὸν χάριν τῆς "νοηματοδοτήσεως" στῶμεν ἅπαξ ἀντίθετοι πρὸς τὴν καταπράνυνσιν τοῦ καταθλιπτικοῦ πόνου ὅστις γεννᾷ τὰς σκέψεις περὶ εὐθανασίας, ἅρα λογικῶς ὀφείλομεν ἴστασθαι χιλιάκις ἀντίθετοι πρὸς τὴν καταπράνυνσιν καὶ παντὸς ἐλάσσονος πόνου, ὅς καθ' ὑμᾶς δεῖ *χρησιμώτατος εἶναι* ἐτοιμάζων ἡμᾶς πρὸς ἀντιμετώπισιν καὶ τοῦ καταθλιπτικοῦ! Ἐστὲ λοιπὸν πράγματι ἄκρως ἀντίθετος καὶ πρὸς αὐτὴν ἔτι τὴν λήψιν τῆς ἀσπιρίνης!; Ὡς ὅτι εἰ οὐ, ὀφείλετ' ἀναθεωρεῖν τὴν ὅλην περὶ πόνου ὑμετέραν φιλοσοφίαν! Καὶ τοῦτο μὲν διὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον. Ἄλλ' ἐὰν ὡς Ὁρθόδοξοι Χριστιανοὶ(;;) διατεινόμεθα παρὰ Θεοῦ ἐπιτρεπτὴν τὴν ἀσπιρίνην ἀλλ' ἀπηγορευμένην τὴν ἄλλως ἀδύνατον πλὴν δι' εὐθανασίας καταπράνυνσιν κυρίως τοῦ ψυχικοῦ (εἰ οὐχὶ καὶ τοῦ φυσικοῦ) πόνου τοῦ ἀσθενοῦς, τόθ' ὀπωσδήποτε μεταβιβάζομεν τὸν παραλογισμόν τῷ Θεῷ καὶ κατηγοροῦμεν Αὐτὸν ὡς τὸν πλέον παντὸς ἄλλου ἀπάνθρωπότατον σαδιστήν!!! Συναφῶς, ποῦ ἀκριβῶς διαχωρίζεθ' ἡ καθ' ὑμᾶς ἀναγκαία "νοηματοδότησις τοῦ πόνου" ἀπὸ τοῦ καθαροῦ (θεολογικῶς πλὴν *κρυφίως* ἐπιβαλλομένου) μαζοχισμοῦ;

3. Προφανῶς, τὸ πρόβλημα ἀπαιτεῖ τὴν ἀνεύρεσιν τῶν ὁρίων 'του καὶ τοῦ σημείου ἰσορροπίας 'του! Καὶ περὶ μὲν τῶν ὁρίων, μᾶλλον διαφαίνεται ὡς ἀρνητικὴ τῆς πραγματικότητος (τουτέστι πέραν αὐτῶν) ἡ ὑμετέρα ἐπιθυμία "λύσεως" καὶ τοῦ τῆς εὐθανασίας προβλήματος διὰ τῆς ἀναβιώσεως τοῦ "ἐνὸς ἄλλου πολιτισμοῦ", ἥτοι τοῦ διὰ τῶν ὡς ἄνω συναφῶν *ὑφ' ὑμῶν ἀθελήτως* (;) ὑπαινισσομένου ὡς ἐπὶ ἔνδεκα αἰῶνας *μαζοχιστικῶς* διαβιώσαντος, καὶ τὸν πόνον "νοηματοδοτήσαντος" βυζαντινοῦ μεσαίωνος· ὅστις *δεῖ ἐπὶ τέλους ὁμολογηθῆναι ὡς ἐκ Θεοῦ δικαίως* τερματισθεὶς δι' ὅσα *δι-αρρήδην ἡρνήθη ποιῆσαι* ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπὸ "θεολογικὸν" πάντοτε κάλυμμα· ὦν τὰς φοβερὰς συνεπειὰς εἰσέτι ὑφίσταται καὶ ὁ τόπος καὶ ἅπας ὁ κόσμος!

4. Περὶ δὲ τοῦ σημείου ἰσορροπίας, τοῦτο δύνατ' εὑρεθῆναι μόνον διὰ τῆς ἀναζητήσεως τοῦ τί ὁ Θεὸς ἔθηκεν ὡς *ἄριστον* ὅριον τῆς ζωῆς ἐκάστου ἡμῶν, οὐ πᾶσα ὑπερβολικὴ συντόμευσις ἢ ὑπέρβασις δεῖ θεωρεῖσθαι ἀπορριπτέα. Ἀσφαλῶς, ὅ,τι διὰ τῶν *συνήθων ὡς καὶ δραστικῶν* χειρουργικῶν ἐπεμβάσεων οὐκ ἐναντιοῦται τῆς διασφάλισεως τῆς *φυσικῆς ἐνιαιότητος* τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, δεῖ ἐπιτρέπεσθαι. Π.χ., ἡ ἐγχείρησις καρδίας χὴ χρήσις μηχανικῶν μέσων πρὸς *ὑποβοήθησιν τῶν ἰδίων ζωτικῶν* τὰνθρώπου ὀργάνων. Ἄλλ' ἡ *ἀντικατάστασις ζωτικῶν ὀργάνων* (ὧν ἄνευ αὐτὴ ἡ ζωὴ ἔστιν ἀδύνατος) εἴτε διὰ μηχανικῶν τοιούτων εἴτε διὰ μεταμοσχεύσεων ἐξ ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων (ὅθεν καὶ *τάνήθικον* δῆθεν "*φιλάνθρωπον*" ὀργάνων ἐμπόριον) *πρέπει ἀπολύτως ἀπαγορεύεσθαι ὡς καταλύουσα τὴν τε φυσικὴν ἐνιαιότητα καὶ τὸ συναπτὸν αὐτῇ νόημα τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, ἥτις *σκοπίμως* δίδοτ' αὐτῷ *ἐγγενῶς ἐμπεριέχουσα καὶ τὸ βιολογικῶς προσδιωρισμένον* αὐτῆς τέλος! Ἐνῷ ἡ ἀποκοπὴ χειρὸς ἢ ποδὸς οὐ συνιστᾷ κατάλυσιν τῆς ζωῆς ἢ στρέβλωσιν τοῦ νοήματός 'της, καὶ συνεπῶς *ἐπιτρέπει καὶ ἐπιβάλλει* τὴν χρῆσιν τεχνητῶν μελῶν πρὸς διευκόλυνσιν τῆς φυσικῆς τὰνθρώπου ζωῆς, ἀντιθέτως, ἡ *ὑπερδραστικὴ χρῆσις ξένων ζωτικῶν ὀργάνων*, μεθόδων καὶ μέσων ἀ-

ποσκοπεῖ εἰς τὴν τεχνητὴν πέραν τῶν φυσικῶν ὁρίων παράτασιν τῆς ζωῆς (χοῦτως ἐνέχει τὴν πλήρη παραμόρφωσιν τοῦ νοήματός 'της), τὰ ὅποια πρέπει θεωρεῖσθαι ἀντιστρατευόμενα τὴν βούλησιν τοῦ Θεοῦ! Εἰ ὁ Θεὸς ἐπεθύμει παράτασιν τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ζωῆς πέραν τοῦ ἐγγενοῦς ἐκάστῳ φυσικοῦ ὁρίου αὐτῆς, ἀσφαλῶς κατεσκεύαζεν ἂν ὑμᾶς μακροβιωτέρους! Πρέπει ἐτοιμάζεσθαι παραδοῦναι ἡμᾶς τῇ Θεοῦ κρίσει, καὶ μὴ τεχνητῶς ἀναβάλλειν αὐτὴν συσσωρεύοντα βλασφημίαις! Ἡ διὰ τεχνητῶν μέσων ἀναβολὴ (ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος), ἢ ἡ ἐπ' ὀρίστον ἀναστολή (πιθανῶς δυνατὴ εἰς τὸ μέλλον) τῆς Θεοῦ κρίσεως ἀλλοιοῖ δραστικῶς τὸ νόημα τῆς ζωῆς: Τὸν μὲν Θεὸν παρουσιάζει ἀδύναμον (καὶ συνεπῶς "ἀνύπαρκτον" τῷ βουλομένῳ οὕτως "ἐρμηνεύειν" τὰ πράγματα) ἐνώπιον τῶν τοιούτων μηχανορραφῶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων· τὴν δὲ κοινωνίαν δυναμιτίζει διὰ τῆς δημιουργίας μέσων παραγωγῆς ἀδικίας, ἐφ' ὅσον ἐκ τῶν πραγμάτων ὀλίγοι ἔσονται οἱ δυνάμενοι ποιεῖν χρήσιν τοιούτων μέσων, ἐνῶ οἱ πάντες καταβαλοῦσι τὰς ἀφανεῖς κοινωνικὰς δαπάνας ὑποστηρίξεως τοῦ τοιούτου συστήματος· τοὺς δ' ἀνθρώπους καθιστᾷ ἠθικῶς ὅλως ἀχαλινώτους διὰ τῆς σιωπηρᾶς πλὴν σαφεστάτης εἰσαγωγῆς τῆς νέας ἀρχῆς τοῦ "ἡ ζωὴ διὰ τὴν ζωὴν αὐτὴν ἐδῶ· ὅλα τᾶλλα εἶναι ψέμματα καὶ κανένα νόημα δὲν ὑπάρχει!" Οὕτως, ἡ θεωρουμένη ὡς θεολογικῶς ἀγαθὴ καὶ ἐπιβεβλημένη πρόθεσις παρατάσεως τῆς ζωῆς διὰ τοιούτων ὑπερδραστικῶν τεχνητῶν ὀργάνων καὶ μέσων ἀποδείκνυτ' ἀντιστρατευομένη αὐτὸν τὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὀρισθέντα σκοπὸν τῆς ζωῆς, τὸν ὅποιον ἐπιδιώκει καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἔτι τῆς "νοηματοδοτήσεως τοῦ πόνου"! "Ὅτι δίδωσι τὰκριβῶς ἀντίθετον νόημα! Ἐπιδιώκοντες τὸ σημεῖον ἰσορροπίας, ὀφείλομεν μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν αὐτὸ καὶ δημιουργεῖν προβλήματα μάλιστα χεῖρονα!

5. Κατὰ τὴν συζήτησιν ἀνεγνώσθη ὁ ὅρκος τοῦ Ἱπποκράτους! Ἐστὶ θλιβερὸν τοιαῦτα κατὰ τῆς εὐθανασίας "πειστήρια" προσκομίζεσθαι κατὰ τὴν παροῦσαν ἡμέραν! "Ὅσοι ἀληθῶς τιμῶσι τὴν μνήμην τοῦ ὀφείλουσι διερωτηθῆναι εἰ αὐτὸς ἀπεδέχοιτο ἂν σήμερον τὴν ἐφαρμογὴν τοῦ ὅρκου 'του ὅλως ἀναλλοιώτου ὑπὸ ταῦτο πάντοτε πνεῦμα κατὰ πᾶσαν σύγχρονον περίστασιν! Οἱ ἀποφεύγοντες τὸ ἐρώτημα οὐκ ἐνεργοῦσιν ἐξ ὅλως ἀγαθῆς προαιρέσεως! Ὁ Ἱπποκράτης ἀσφαλῶς οὐκ ἐξεμεταλλεύθη ἀσθενῇ 'του πρὸς ἴδιον πλουτισμόν! Ἄλλως ἔχουσι τὰ πράγματα σήμερον, ὅτε ἡ "βιομηχανία τῆς υἱείας" ἀπροσκόπτως ἡγείται τοῦ πληθωρισμοῦ παγκοσμίως, παρὰ τὴν γνησίαν ἀδυναμίαν τῶν κοινωνιῶν καλύψαι τὰς δαπάνας! Πρὸ ἡμερῶν, θῦμα τι δυστηχήματος ἐν τῇ κεντρικῇ Ἑλλάδι ἐσκυλεύθη συστηματικῶς ὑφ' ὁμάδος ἱατρῶν δραμόντων ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν ἐν ἀκαρεῖ (πῶς οὖν ἂρ' ὄντως, εἰ οὐ τι προέγνωσαν περὶ τοῦ "δυστυχήματος";)· οὐ τὰ ὄργανα ἀπεστάλησαν ἐπειγόντως ἀεροπορικῶς εἰς Ἀθήνας καὶ Θεσσαλονίκην πρὸς μεταμόσχευσιν, καὶ ἡ ὅλη ἐπιχείρησις ἐπαρουσιάσθη ὡς μεγάλη ἐπιτυχία τῆς ἐδῶ ἐπιστήμης καὶ τοῦ θλιβεροῦ κράτους! Δεῖ μ' ἐπαναλαμβάνειν ὥστε μὴ τι παρανοηθῇ: Δεδομένης τῆς ἀπαραιτήτου βιολογικῆς συμβατότητος δότου καὶ λήπτου, μόνον κατόπιν ἐπισταμένης βιολογικῆς ἐξετάσεως ἀμφοτέρων καθισταμένης γνωστῆς, ἐρωτᾶται: Πῶς ἐν ἀκαρεῖ ἐγνώρισαν οἱ ἱατροὶ τὴν βιολογικὴν ταυτότητα τοῦ θύματος ὥστε σπεῦσαι πρὸς σκύλευσιν; Θῦμα ἦν δυστυχήματος, ἢ "δυστυχήματος"; Οὐ πλέον ἐστὶ κυνισμὸς διερωτᾶσθαι

τινὰ περὶ τῆς γνησιότητος τοῦ δυστυχήματος καὶ οὐχὶ τούτου μόνον (τάν-
τίθετον μᾶλλον ἀποτελεῖ κυνισμόν), ὅτε ἄνθρωποι ἐξαφανίζονται μυστηριω-
δῶς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ, τὸ ἐμπόριον τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ὀργάνων ἀνθεῖ, ὁλόκλη-
ρος "βιομηχανία" ἀποζῇ ἐκ τῶν μεταμοσχεύσεων, *κἀναμφιβόλως*, βιολογι-
κῶς σπάνια ὄργανα *ἐστὶ περιζήτητα καὶ καταζητούμενα*, καθ' ὃν χρόνον
"ἐκεῖ ἔξω" περιπατοῦσιν, ὑγιεῖς καὶ ἀμέριμνοι, πτωχοὶ καὶ ἀνυπεράσπιστοι
παῖδες καὶ ὠριμοὶ ἄνθρωποι, συνεχῶς ὑποβλεπόμενοι (ἢ καὶ δολοφονούμε-
νοι) διὰ τὸ δι' ἄλλους πολυτιμότερον σῶμα ἔσθαι! Ταῦτα πάντα δημιουργή-
ματ' ἐστὶ τῶν φαντασιώσεων περὶ τῆς "ιερότητος" τῆσδε "ζωῆς" (καὶ τῶν
δῆθεν "ιερῶν" κατὰ τῆς εὐθανασίας ἀγώνων!), δι' ἧς ὑποκαθιστῶμεν τὴν
ἀγιότητα τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου!

6. Ὑμεῖς δ' αὐτὸς διηρωτήσατε περὶ τῆς δῆθεν καὶ αὐτῆς ἐκ τῆς ξέ-
νης ἐλθοῦσης μανίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων περὶ δικαιωμάτων καὶ ἀξιοπρεπείας
(τουλάχιστον τοῦ θανάτου)· καθ' ὑμᾶς ἐννοιῶν "ἀγνώστων" εἰς τὴν ἀρχαίαν
Ἑλλάδα! Μὴ ὦν φιλόλογος ἵνα πλείονα παραθέσω, περιορίζομαι μόνον εἰς
τοῦτο: Ἐν τῷ *Ἑλληνικῷ Λεξικῷ κατὰ Πάπε* τοῦ Ἀθ. Α. Σακελλαρίου ("Ἐκδ.
4η, Τομ. Α, 1887, σελ. 940) ἀναγράφεται: "Δικαίωμα": ... β) δικαία ἀπαιτή-
σις, εἰς πλ. Θουκ. 1,41...!!! Τοῦτο καὶ ἡ μνεία τῶν *συνεχῶν* ἀγώνων μεταξὺ
τῶν ἐν ἀρχαίαις Ἀθήναις κομμάτων (δημοκρατικοῦ καὶ ὀλιγαρχικοῦ) *ἀρ-
κοῦσιν* ἕτερα σχόλια περιττεύουσιν! Ἡ σύγχρονος ἀναβίωσις τῶν περὶ "δι-
καίων ἀπαιτήσεων" ἀπαιτήσεων τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἠκολούθησε τὴν βραδείαν
ἀποτίναξιν κυρίως τοῦ "ἐκκλησιατικοῦ" ζυγοῦ, κατὰ τὸν μεσαῖωνα καθήσαν-
τος ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων τραχήλων ὡς οὐδέποτε μέχρι τότε ἦ ἔκτοτε. Ἐστὶ
πολὺ θλιβερὸν ὅτι τουλάχιστον ὑμεῖς ἐπιτίθεσθε κατὰ τῆς ἀπαιτήσεως δι-
καιωμάτων, ὅτε δεῖ πάντας τοὺς ἠθικῶς ὑγιεῖς ἐπιτίθεσθαι μόνον κατὰ τῆς
ὑπὸ τῶν νέων Ἑλλήνων *ἐκπορνείσεως καὶ αὐτῶν* διὰ τῶν περὶ *ἀδίκων ἀπαι-
τήσεων* ἀπαιτήσεων τῶν! Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἀξιοπρεπείας· ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ὡς ἄνω
πηγῇ ἀναγινώσκω: "Ἀξιοπρέπεια": ἡ ἀξία, σεμνότης, κοσμιότης, σοβαρό-
της. "Ἀξιοπρεπής": εἰς ὃν ἐμπρέπει ἡ ἀξία, κόσμος, ἔντιμος· Ξεν. συμπ.
8, 80!!! Ὅτε τόσον πολὺ λησμονεῖται σήμερον ἡ ἀρχαία περὶ τιμῆς "μανία"
τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ τὸ *γνήσιον* τῶν νεωτέρων "φιλότιμον", διατί ἄρα μὴ δεῖ
τυγχάνειν ἐμπορικῆς ἐκμεταλλεύσεως καὶ ὁ θάνατος, ὑπὸ τὸ προκάλυμμα
"εὐσεβείας" καὶ "ἐπιστημονικῆς-ιατρικῆς δεοντολογίας"; **Everybody has his
price!!!** Ἐστὶ θλιβερὸν ὅτι περὶ τὴν διάστασιν ἀνθρώπου καὶ "Ἐκκλησίας"
συντάσσεσθε μετὰ ταύτης καὶ κατ' ἐκείνου, ὡς ἂν ὁ Χριστὸς ἦλθε διὰ τὴν
"Ἐκκλησίαν" καὶ οὐχὶ τὴν *πλήρη τιμὴν* τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· εἰσέτι δυστυχῶς ὡς
"ἀπολωλὸς" προβάτου θεωρουμένου ὃ σῶζουσιν οἱ "ποιμένες", οὐχὶ διὰ
τὴν κατὰ τὴν παραβολὴν πολὺ μείζονα ἀξίαν τοῦ τιμωμένου ὑπὸ τῶν ἔτι
μεσαιωνικῶς σκεπτομένων "ποιμένων"! Καὶ ἐστὶ θλιβερότατον ὅτι ὑπὸ τὸ
πρόσχημα τῆς "ἐλευθερίας τῶν πιστῶν", διαπρεπεῖς ὡς ὑμεῖς διακηρύττου-
σιν ὡς "σεβασμὸν πρὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον" τὴν *ἀσυγχώρητον* ἀδράνειαν τῆς
Ἑλληνικῆς "Ἐκκλησίας"· ἀπ' αἰῶνων ὑπερκερασθείσης ὑπὸ προβλημάτων
μεστῶν καὶ *δεινῶν θεολογικῶν συνεπειῶν*, τῶν ὁποίων τὴν ὑπαρξίν τόνον
πεισιμόνως κἀδικαιολογητῶς ἀρνεῖται· περὶ πολλὰ ἄλλα τυρβάζουσα, *ἀδυ-
νατοῦσα* μᾶλλον δὲ κάρνουμένη ἵστασθαι *σὺν Χριστῷ* ὁδηγός!

Ἐλπίζω ὅτι τουλάχιστον ὑμεῖς εὐρήσετε τὰ ὡς ἄνω στοιχειωδῶς ἐνδιαφέροντα καὶ τοὺς Ἑλληνας, πεισματικῶς συρομένους μακρὰν ὀπισθεν τῶν καιρῶν καὶ γενικῶς υἱοθετοῦντας "λύσεις" ἀπὸ καιροῦ ἀπορριφθείσας ὑπὸ λαῶν καὶ μελετητῶν ἐκ τοῦ σύνεγγυς καὶ ἄνευ παροπίδων ἐξεταζόντων καὶ τὰ ἠθικὰ προβλήματα τοῦ συγχρόνου πολιτισμοῦ· οὐχὶ ὡς οἱ ἐνταῦθα νοσταλγικῶς ἐπιζητούντων ἀναστρέψαι τὴν ἐπὶ τὰ πρόσω καλπάζουσιν τοῦ πολιτισμοῦ ἱστορίαν!

Λύπη μόνη, οὐχὶ δέ τις διάθεσις προσωπικῆς τριβῆς μεθ' ὑμῶν, διατάσσει τὴν παρούσαν! Ὅτι ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ ὁ ἀποδέκτης ὀφείλεται εἰς τὴν θέσιν ἣν ὑπηρετεῖτε, τουλάχιστον διὰ τῶν ὑμετέρων δημοσίων ἐμφανίσεων! Ἐὰν συνηθίζεται ἐν Ἑλλάδι ἡ γνωστοποίησις λήψεως, μετὰ χαρᾶς ἐκτιμήσω αὐτήν, ὁμολογοῦσαν τὸ ἐλάχιστον στοιχειῶδες· ὅτι ὁ κόπος τῆς παρούσης οὐκ ἀπέβη ὅλος εἰς μάτην, δεδομένης καὶ τῆς ποιότητος τῶν ἐνταῦθα ταχυδρομείων.

Φιλικώτατα,

ΑΠΟΚΡΙΣΙΣ: Οὐδεμία.

Re: ΠΕΡΙ ΥΠΑΡΞΕΩΣ ΘΕΟΥ

Κύριον Ρένον Ἡρ. Ἀποστολίδην
Μονῆς Κύκκου 10, Παπάγου
Ἀθήνας, 15669

21-26 Δεκεμβρίου 1996

Ἀγαπητὲ Κύριε Ἀποστολίδη:

Ἡ ὑμετέρα τῆς χθεσινῆς ἐσπέρας παρέμβασις τῇ "συζητήσει" περὶ ὑπάρξεως τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπανήλθεν εἰς ὃ, τι προσεπάθησ' ἀνακινήσ' ἀπὸ τηλεφώνου πρὸ δύο ἢ τριῶν ἐβδομάδων! Ἐπιτρέψατέ μοι ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ εὐκαιρίᾳ ἐπανελθεῖν **φιλικῶς** δι' ὀλίγων (ὥς γ' ἐλπίζω!). Ὡς μηχανικὸς μορφωθείς, ζήσας καὶ ἐργασθεὶς κυρίως εἰς τὴν *πρακτικὴν* "Δύσιν", κάσχολούμενος περὶ τὸ *λύειν* προβλήματα, οὐχὶ "συζητεῖν" ἀενάως ἐπὶ κενῷ, *ἀλλως* ἀντιμετωπίζω τὰ πράγματα. Καὶ *σαφῶς διαχωρίζω* τὸν *ἀμέριστον* πρὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον σεβασμὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ πρὸς τὰ ὑπὸ κείνου δηλούμενα, δικαιούμενα σεβασμοῦ *μόνον ἂν ὧσιν ὁρθά!* Παρακαλῶ οὕτως ὑμᾶς ὅπως ἐν τῷ *αὐτῷ* πνεύματι ἀντιμετωπίσῃτε τὴν *γενικὴν*, οὐχὶ *προσωπικὴν*, αὐστηρότητα τῶν ὧδε παρατιθεμένων! Ἀεὶ προσπαθῶ οἱ λόγοι μου εἶναι ὡς καὶ τὰ σχέδιά μου ὡς μηχανικοῦ, ἀπεικονιστικὰ τοῦ "ἐκεῖ ἔξω" κόσμου, οὐχὶ περιγραφὰ τῶν φαντασιώσεών μου· κἀνταποκρίνεσθαι τῇ *ἀντικειμένη πραγματικῇ βαρεῖᾳ οὐσίᾳ*, μᾶλλον ἢ εἶναι λόγοι κενοὶ ἐνὸς ἔτι τοῖς πράγμασιν ἀσχέτου τινός.

Ἡ "συζήτησις", ὡς καὶ πᾶς ἐν Ἑλλάδι ὁμοία, *ἀπέτυχε παταγωδῶς*: οὐδεὶς ἀπεκόμισέ τι καινόν, *οὐδεὶς* τῶν ἀναριθμήτων ἐπιθυμούντων διεφώτισθη! Τὰ μὲν ἐρωτήματα σαφῶς κατετέθησαν, ὅμως *οὐδεὶς*, ὡς γε σύνηθες ἐν Ἑλλάδι, ἀπήντησεν εὐθέως τε καὶ τιμίως! Δύο *σαφῶς χωριστὰ* ἀπ' ἀλλήλων προβλήματα, τὸ τῆς ὑπάρξεως ἢ ἀνυπαρξίας Θεοῦ καὶ τὸ τοῦ *πῶς* "τίθεται" καὶ "συζητεῖται" τὸ πρῶτον, ἀνεμίχθησαν κοῦδόλως διεχωρίσθησαν!

ΤΙΝΕΣ ΤΙΘΕΑΣΙ ΤΟ ΠΕΡΙ ΥΠΑΡΞΕΩΣ ΘΕΟΥ ΠΡΟΒΛΗΜΑ.

Ἀσφαλῶς, αὐτῷ ὑμεῖς ἀναφέρεσθε, ἀλλ' *αὐτά* γε τὰ πράγματα ἤδη ὑμᾶς *διαψεύδουσιν!* Ὅτε πολλοὶ *ἄνθρωποι ἀνεξαρτήτως ἀπὸ τῶν περὶ αὐτοὺς πραγμάτων ὁρμώμενοι* τὸ πρόβλημα τοῦτο τιθέασι, *ὄντως τὸ πρόβλημα πράγματι τίθεται!* Ἄρ' ἀποτελεῖ *τῆς πραγματικότητος ἄρνησιν* τὸ λέγειν τὸ πρόβλημα μὴ "τιθέμενον"! Ἐπὶ γῆς *ἔξ* *δισεκατομμύρι* ἰσχυρῶν ὑπάρχουσιν: *αὐτοὶ* κατὰ τὴν μεγίστην αὐτῶν πλειονότητα τιθέασι τὸ πρόβλημα πρὸς *οὐσιώδη* συζήτησιν, οὐχὶ οἱ *ὀλίγοι* αὐταποκαλούμενοι "διανοοῦμενοι", οἱ *ἐρήμην* αὐτῆς τῆς πραγματικότητος *διατεινόμενοι* "διανοεῖσθαι" ἐπὶ τοῦ προβλήματος! Ἄλλ' ὡσαύτως, πλὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων *ὑπάρχουσι* καὶ

τὰ ἀνεξάρτητα τῶν γνωμῶν ἡμῶν πράγματα! Μήπως ἄρα κάκεῖνα τὸ πρόβλημα ὑποβάλλουσι καὶ πῶς τοῦτο ποιοῦσι;

Τιθέμενον παρ' ἀνθρώπων.

Εἰ ὡς μηχανικὸς "οὐκ ἔχω" πρόβλημα στέγης, "ἄρα οὐκ ἔχει κοῦ πρέπει θεωρεῖν ἔχειν" πρόβλημα στέγης καὶ ὁ πελάτης μου; Τίνος εἶδους συλλογισμὸς ἐστὶν οὗτος; Εἰ τὸ πρόβλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ "οὐ τίθεται" δι' ἐμέ, πῶς ἄρ' οὐκ ἂν ἀπετέλει ὑπεροψίαν ἀσυγχώρητον ἀπὸ μέρους μου ἀπλῶς ἰσχυρίζεσθαι τὸ πρόβλημα *πράγματι* μὲν *τιθέμενον* δι' ἑξ̄ δισεκατομμύρια ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλὰ μόνον διότι πάντες αὐτοὶ παρεφρόνησαν καὶ παραλογίζοντ' ἀνεπιγνώστως, πλὴν ἄνευ ἀπὸ μέρους μου φροντίδος τινὸς πρὸς *τάποδεικνύναι* ὅτι *πράγματι* εἷς ἕκαστος ἐξ αὐτῶν ὄντως παραλογίζεται; Ἀκόμη καὶ μόνον ἐὰν εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐ παραλογίζεται ἀπαιτῶν τοῦ προβλήματος λύσιν, τὸ πρόβλημα *ἤδη τεθημένον ἐστὶν ἄνευ τινὸς παραλογισμοῦ!* Τότ' ἐγὼ μᾶλλον *δέομαι* ἀναθεωρῆσαι τὰ παρ' ἐμοῦ *πιστευόμενα* περὶ τῆς τοῦ προβλήματος δῆθεν ἀνυπαρξίας! Ἀλλ' ὡσαύτως, πῶς ἄρ' οὐκ εἰμὶ *πλήρως* ὑπεύθυνος διὰ τὰ παρ' ἐμοῦ *πιστευόμενα*, ἂν *ἀδοκίμως* υἱοθετῶ πεποιθήσεις ἐτέρων; Ἐφ' ὅσον ἀντίθετον τῆς πίστεως ἐστὶ *μόνη* ἢ *ἐπισταμένη* *χρῶς* *λογικῶς* *ὀρθῇ ἀποδεδειγμένη*, ἄρ' οὖν *στερρὰ γνώσις*, ἔχω ἄραγ' ἐγὼ *τοιαύτην* *πράγματι* γνώσιν ὥστε *δικαιούσθαι* μὴ θεωρεῖν πλέον αὐτὰ λογικῶς χρήζοντ' ἀντιμετωπίσεως διὰ πίστεως; Εἰ μὲν *τοιαύτης* *κέκτημαι* *γνώσεως*, *οὐκ ἔξεστί μοι* ἀποκρύπτειν αὐτήν! Εἰ ὅμως *ἄνευ τοιαύτης γνώσεως* ἀπλῶς δηλῶ ὡς ὑμεῖς ὅτι "εἰμὶ ἄπιστος (ἤτοι εὐρίσκομαι *πέραν* τοῦ εἶναι με ἄθεον, ἀναγνωρίζων ὅτι *χὴ ἀθεΐα ἐστὶ πίστις*)", ἀπλῶς δηλῶ ὅτι *αὐθαιρέτως* ἀπεφάσισα οὐχὶ ἀπλῶς ἀναστεῖλαι τὴν πίστιν μου ἔναντι καὶ τῶν δύο ἐξ ἴσου δυσαρέστων ἐπιλογῶν (ὅτε ὥφελον ἂν ἀποκαλεῖν ἐμαυτὸν ἀγνωστικιστὴν), ἀλλ' *ἀγνοῆσαι* *ὑπάρχοντα* *πράγματα ὄντως* ὑποκείμενα τῇ ὅλως *κεχωρισμένην* *πράξει* τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῇ διακριτῇ γενομένη ὡς πίστει! Ἀλλὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἀποτελεῖ πλέον *λογικὴν* ἀντιμετώπισιν τῆς "ἐκεῖ ἔξω" πραγματικότητος, ἀλλὰ μόνον *πεισματικὴν αὐτῆς ἄρνησιν*, *καθαρῶς* *ψυχολογικὰ* ἔχουσιν αἷτια! Τίτι δικαιώματι, τότε, ἀντιπαράτασσω καὶ δοκῶ ὑπερτέραν τὴν ἐμὴν *ψυχολογίας* *κατάστασιν* ἐκείνης τῶν λοιπῶν ἐξ̄ δισεκατομμυρίων ἀνθρώπων; Ἀλλ' ἐστὶν ἡ *ψυχολογικὴ* *κατάστασις* *ένος* *έκάστου* τῶν ἐξ̄ δισεκατομμυρίων παραλογιζομένων, ἢ τοῦ *ένος* *μόνου* *μὴ* παραλογιζομένου, ἐφ' ἧς τὸ πρόβλημα ὄντως ἐδράζεται; *Καὶ τὸ ἓν καὶ τὸ ἄλλο* *χρήζουσι* *τῆς* *πλέον* *ἐπισταμένης* *ἐπιστημονικῆς* *ἐξετάσεως!* Τὸ μὲν διὰ τὰ *ἀντικειμενικὰ* *εἰ* *καὶ* *μόνον* *ψυχολογικὰ* αἷτια τῆς ἀποκλειστικότητος!

Τιθέμενον παρὰ τῶν πραγμάτων.

Ἄλλ' ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐστὶ τὸ *τελευταῖον* ἐπὶ γῆς ἐμφανισθὲν ὄν! Εἷς *προϋπάρχας* "μὴ φυσικὸς παρατηρητὴς" (a non-physical observer, κατὰ τὴν ἀκριβῆ ἐπιστημονικὴν ἔκφρασιν), δηλ. *ἀπηλλαγμένος* τῶν ἀδυναμιῶν καὶ τοῦ *ψυχολογικοῦ* ἀνθρωπίνου φορτίου, ὥφελε διερωτᾶσθαι (*καὶ μετὰ κείνου καὶ*

παρά ταύτας καὶ πάντες ἡμεῖς) εἰ τὸ πρόβλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς κατασκευαστοῦ τοῦ κόσμου τίθεται ἀπὸ μόνης αὐτῆς ταύτης τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ὑπάρξεως! Μόνον ἔάν ὁ κόσμος ἀποδειχθῇ πράγματι αἰδίδιος (ἤτοι ἄνευ ἐνάρξεως, οὐχὶ ἄνευ ἀρχῶν-νόμων καὶ ἀρχῆς-ἐξουσίας, ὅτε καὶ ἅπαν τὸ περὶ αὐτῶν πρόβλημα τίθεται ἐναργέστατ' ἐκ τῶν πραγμάτων!), δικαιοῦμαι ἀπολῦσαι τὴν σκέψιν περὶ τοῦ Δημιουργοῦ 'του! (Ὁμοίως δέ, μόνον ἔάν ὁ Θεὸς ἀποδειχθῇ πράγματι ἔχων ἀρχήν, ὑποχρεοῦμαι μὴ ἀπολῦσαι τὴν σκέψιν περὶ τοῦ Κείνου εἰς τὸ εἶν' ἐνεγκόντος!). Ἐτερόν τι οὐκ ἀποτελεῖ ὀρθὴν κρίσιν!

Αἱ διάφοροι προελεύσεις τῶν πιστευομένων Θεῶν.

Πολλὴ ἐστὶν ἡ γεγονυῖα "συζήτησις" περὶ τοῦ τίς ἐδημιούργησε τίνα, ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἢ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τὸν Θεόν. Σαφῶς, μόνον ὁ καθαρῶς ψυχολογικῶς εἰσαγόμενος Θεὸς ἐστὶ δημιούργημα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπιζητούντος καθησυχᾶσαι τὰς καθαρῶς ψυχολογικὰς 'του ἀνησυχίας! Καὶ μόνον τοιοῦτος Θεὸς ἀπορρίπτεται χυπὸ πολλῶν ψυχολογικῶς πρὸς τοιοῦτόν τινα Θεὸν ἀντιτιθεμένων! Ὁ καθαρῶς λογικῶς εἰσαγόμενος Θεός, ὢν προῖδον ὀρθῆς λογικῆς διεργασίας, ἐστὶν ὅλως διάφορος τοῦ προηγουμένου καὶ μὴ ἀπορρίψιμος καθ' ὃν χρόνον ἡ Λογικὴ λογικῶς θεωρεῖται ὑπερτέρα πάντων ἡμῶν, ἐξ ἧς μόνης αἰτίας κἀπαιτεῖται ἡ παρά πάντων εἰς ταύτην ὑποταγή! Ἀντιθέτως, παράλογος ἐστὶν ἡ ἀπόρριψις τοῦ οὕτως εἰσαγομένου Θεοῦ! Μόνον ἂν ὁ διὰ τῆς "λογικῆς" (οὐ γὰρ πλέον τῆς Λογικῆς) εἰσαγόμενος Θεὸς διαπιστωθῇ ὡς προῖδον συλλογιστικοῦ σφάλματος ἐπηρεάσαντος τἀποτέλεσμα τῆς διανοητικῆς ἐπὶ τοῦτο διεργασίας, ἐπιβάλλεθ' ἡ τούτου ἀπόρριψις! Βεβαίως ὑπάρχουσι καὶ οἱ μεικτῶς εἰσαγόμενοι Θεοί· ὦν πρό, τὸ Λογικὸν καθήκον ἐπιβάλλει τὴν ἐνδελεχῆ ἐξέτασιν τῶν διαφορῶν δηλώσεων κἀπόρριψιν μόνον τῶν μὴ ὀρθῶς Λογικῶς εἰσηγμένων!

"Ἄνευ τινὸς ἀμφιβολίας, ὁ ὀρθῶς Λογικῶς εἰσαγόμενος Θεὸς ἐστὶ τὸ πολυτιμότεον δυνατόν προῖδον κἀγαθὸν τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης σκέψεως· χὴ ἀπόρριψις 'του ἀποτελεῖ ἀσύγγνωστον ἔγκλημα κατ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ πολιτισμοῦ καὶ διαστροφῆν ἐπὶ τὴν βαρβαρότητα! Διότι ἄνευ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὑποβιβάζεται πράγματι, ὡς σήμερον μετὰ τρόμου διαπιστοῦμεν, εἰς τὸ εἶναι μίαν παντελῶς περιττὴν πεπτικὴν μηχανὴν παραγωγῆς περιττωμάτων· ὡς καὶ τινων δῆθεν "πνευματικῶν" δραστηριοτήτων ὡς ἄλλας καὶ πέπερι ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἐπιπασσομένων κατὰ τὴν ἀκάθεκτον ἐπὶ τὸ μηδὲν τῆς κοινωνίας καταγωγὴν! Οἱ προσπαθοῦντες διὰ παντὸς ἐλεῖν τὸν Θεὸν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐαυτῶν πρώτων σκέψεως ὀφείλουσι καταγινῶναι τὶ ὄντως ἐστὶν ὅπερ δι' αὐτοὺς πρώτους οἱ λοιποὶ πάντες καλοῦνται συναγαγεῖν!

Οὐδεμία ὑπάρχει ἀμφιβολία: πολλὰ στοιχεῖα τῶν ἀνατολικῶν θρησκειῶν (ὡς καὶ τῆς τῆς "Ὁρθοδοξίας", διὰ τῶν εἰσέτι ἐν αὐτῇ ἀπομεινασῶν ἀνατολικῶν ἐπιρροῶν) ἔχουσι προέλευσιν καθαρῶς ψυχολογικὴν (καὶ ὅτι οἱ πλείστοι "πιστοὶ" ψυχολογικῶς μόνον "πιστεύουσιν")! Οὐχὶ ὅμως καὶ ὁ καθ' ὅλα Λογικὸς περὶ τὸν Θεὸν τρόπος τῶν Σωκράτους καὶ Πλάτωνος! Ὁρθῶς ἡ Θεοῦ ἀπόρριψις ἐθεωρήθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Πλάτωνος ὡς ἡ ἐπικινδυνωτάτη τῆς κοινωνίας ἀσθένεια! Οὐδεμίαν μισαλλοδοξίαν ἢ φανατισμὸν ἐμπεριείχε ἡ περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ θέσις τοῦ Πλάτωνος, κηδομένου τῆς πολυτιμοτάτης χρησιμότη-

τος τῆς πολιτισμικῆς κατακτίσεως τῆς ιδέας περὶ Θεοῦ (καὶ λογικόν ἐστιν ἀναμένειν τινὰ παρὰ τῶν πρὸς ταύτην διαφωνούντων, εἰς τὸν Πλάτων' ἀπαντῆσαι *πρὸ παντός ἄλλου*)! Ἀναμφιβόλως, ὁ Πλάτων σκληρὸς ἦν λίαν, ἀλλ' εἶχε πλήρῃ ἐπίγνωσιν τῶν διακυβευομένων! Διὰ τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων περὶ τὴν Λογικὴν ἐπακολουθήσασαν *μαλακίαν* ἐπετράπη ἡ περὶ τὴν ἀθείαν *δῆθεν* "ἠθικὴ" τούτων ἐλευθερία, μὴδὲ τῆς Λογικῆς κηδομένη, ἥτις τοσαῦτα δεινὰ ἐσώρευσεν ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος! Διότι ἐκ τῆς δι' ἀθείας *γενικευομένης* ἐγκληματικότητος, θρηνοῦμεν ἀναμφιβόλως *πολλάκις* *πολλάπλασια* θύματα τῶν ὅσων ἐθρηνοῦμεν ἂν δι' ἐκτελέσεων ἐπιβαλλομένων διὰ Πλατωνικοῦ νόμου ἐπ' ἀπιστίᾳ κατὰ τοῦ *Λογικοῦ καθ' ὅλα Θεοῦ*! Καὶ διὰ ταύτην τὴν ἀνυπερβλήτον κοινωνικὴν τοῦ πράγματος σοβαρότητα, ὁ Πλάτων οὐκ ἐπέδίκασεν εἰς τὸ *σύνηθες* "ἱερατεῖον" τὸ ὑψιστον κοινωνικὸν καθήκον κρίσεως τῶν ἐπ' ἀπιστίᾳ παρανομοούντων! Ἡ ἀντίληψις περὶ Λόγου οὐκ ἐστὶ λοιπὸν νεοπλατωνικὴ, ἀλλ' Ἡρακλείτειος *ὡς ἐπὶ βράδιστοι*! Μόνον ὅτι διὰ τοῦ Πλάτωνος ἤνρε τὴν ὑψίστην αὐτῆς διατύπωσιν! Δυστυχέστατα διὰ τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς, ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχῶν τοῦ μεσαίωνος, ὡς καὶ τὴ ἡ "Ὁρθοδοξία", μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν Ἑλληνικῶν γραμμάτων, *ἀπέλυσε καὶ τὴν περὶ Ὁρθοῦ Λόγου Θεολογίαν*! Καὶ ἔκτοτε *παραλογίζετ'* ἐν πολλοῖς, *διαρρήδην μέχρι τῆς σήμερον*, καὶ *ἀρνούμενη* ἐξετάσαι ὡς καὶ τὴν τὴν *θεμελιώδη λογικότητα* τοῦ κόσμου ὡς *θείου κατασκευάσματος* καὶ *ἐναντιουμένη κατὰ πάσης οὐσιαστικῆς* ἐπιστημονικῆς προόδου τῆς κοινωνίας· *ἣν φοβεῖται διὰ τὴν ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ ἀπιστίαν* τῶν ταύτης "ἱεραρχῶν"!

Διὰ τὴν τοιαύτην τῶν *ἀνατολικῶν* "χριστιανῶν" στάσιν ἔμειναν ἀπαίδευτοι περὶ τὸν Λόγον χοῖ γενικῶς πολὺ ὀλιγώτερον τότε πεπαιδευμένοι δυτικοί, φθάσαντες εἰς τὰς γνωστὰς ἀνεπιτρέπτους ὑπερβολάς, ἀλλ' οὐχί γε βεβαίως ἐν Πλατωνικῷ πνεύματι, οὓς ἔτι χλευάζουσιν, *οὕτως ἀπερισκέπτως*, οἱ πρῶτοι! Ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτο: *Τόση* ἐστὶν ἡ διανοητικὴ ἀφασία τῶν ἀνατολικῶν "χριστιανῶν", διαπιστουμένη ἐκ τῆς *πλήρους* ἀπουσίας *οὐσιώδους* προόδου τῆς περὶ τὰ θεολογικὰ αὐτῶν σκέψεως μετὰ τὰς οἰκουμενικὰς συνόδους καὶ δεδομένης τῆς *μὴ ἐξαντλήσεως* τῆς περὶ ταῦτα γνώσεως τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὥστε δικαιοῦσθαι τινὰ διερωτᾶσθαι μήπως ἡ ἀπουσία παρ' αὐτοῖς ὑπερβολῶν ἀναλόγων ἐκείνων τῶν μεσαιωνικῶν δυτικῶν (ιδίως μετὰ τὰ περὶ τὴν Εἰκονομαχίαν μεγάλα ὄντως δεινὰ) ὀφείλετ' εἰς σοφίαν μᾶλλον ἢ εἰς αὐτὴν τὴν *ἔλλειψιν* θάρρους καὶ πίστεως, ἐκ μέρους μὲν τῶν διαφωνούντων πρὸς τὸ ἐκφράσαι νέαν τινὰ καὶ "ἐπικίνδυνον" γνώμην, ἐκ μέρους δὲ τῶν ἐπιβαλόντων τὸ καθεστῶς δόγμα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιβάλλειν τοῦτο καὶ δι' αὐτῆς τῆς ὑστάτης ποινῆς! Ὅτοι διερωτᾶσθαι τινὰ, τίς ἐστὶ χεῖρων, ἢ διὰ πυρᾶς τρομοκρατία ἢ ἡ τοιαύτη δι' *ἀφανῶν ἄλλων* μεθόδων, καθιστωσῶν τὴν πρῶτην παντελῶς περιττήν!

Ο ΔΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΚΟΣΜΟΥ ΕΙΣΑΓΟΜΕΝΟΣ ΥΨΙΣΤΟΣ ΘΕΟΣ.

Πῶς ἡ Τούτου ἀναζήτησις τίθεται.

Παρά τὰς τῆς Γραφῆς διαβεβαιώσεις ὅτι "ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν" καὶ "ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος", οἱ Χριστιανοὶ οὐδέν ὡς ἐκ-

κλησία ἐποίησαν πρὸς ἐπιβεβαίωσιν, Λογικὴν τε καὶ χρονικὴν τε καὶ κατὰ τὴν αὐτῶν σπουδαιότητα τῆς αὐτῶν συμβολῆς τῇ τοῦ παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου κατασκευῇ! Ἀντιθέτως καὶ κυρίως οἱ "Ὁρθόδοξοι", σχιζοφρενικῶς *ἐπέτρεψαν τὴν διὰ τοῦ παραθύρου ἐπανεῖσοδον τῆς διαρχίας* Θεοῦ-Καλοῦ καὶ κόσμου-κακοῦ, διὰ τῆς κατὰ δῆθεν "θείας οἰκονομίας" *ὡς ἐπ' ἐλάχιστον* διὰ τὰς ἀνθρωπίνας ἀνάγκας *χρήσεως* τοῦ δευτέρου καὶ τῆς ταπεινῆς κὰς ἁμαρτίας ὁδηγούσης αὐτοῦ ὕλης, παρ' ὅτι, *παρалоγιζόμενοι*, θεωροῦσιν ὡς *ἡμιαγίαν καὶ τὴν ὕλην* (ἀλλὰ μόνον διότι ταύτην ἐνανθρωπήσας ἐνεδύσατο ὁ Χριστὸς): παντελῶς ἐν ταύτῳ παρορόντες καὶ τὸ *καίριον* περὶ τῆς *Οὐσίας* τῆς Θεότητος ὡς Καθαροῦ Πνεύματος ὄντολογικὸν πρόβλημα, τὸ καθάπτόμενον ταύτης *τελείας καὶ πλήρους* ἐν ἐαυτῇ πιστευομένης καὶ πρὸ τῆς Ἐνανθρωπήσεως (ἥτοι *μὴ περιεχούσης* ὕλην δημιουργηθεῖσαν) καὶ μετὰ τὴν Ἀνάληψιν (ἥτοι *περιεχούσης καὶ τὸ ὑλικὸν* τοῦ Ἰησοῦ σώμα): καὶ τὸ μέγα πρόβλημα τῆς Θεοδικίας *καθισταμένης ἀδυνάτου, καταργουμένων αὐτομάτως* τῶν ἐννοιῶν τῆς διὰ τῆς ὕλης ἁμαρτίας καὶ τῆς περὶ καὶ ταύτην ἀποδόσεως Δικαιοσύνης ἀφ' ἧς στιγμῆς ἡ ὕλη ὁμολογηθῇ κατ' ἐλάχιστον ἡμιαγία! Ἐνῶ, ἡ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν τῶν νεκρῶν πιστευομένη "μετάλλαξις" τῶν *ὕλικῶν* σωμάτων ἀπὸ *καθαρῶς* ὕλης εἰς πνευματικὰ "σώματα" (ἡ τῶν μελῶν τῶν ὁποίων ἀκριβὴς φύσις καὶ χρησιμότης ἐν πνευματικῷ παραδείσῳ εἰσὶ "λεπτομέρειαι" οὐδόλως ἀπασχολοῦσαι τοὺς οὕτω "θεολογούντας") *δεῖ θεωρεῖσθαι Λογικῶς καὶ ὄντοΛογικῶς ἀδύνατος* ὡς καὶ δι' αὐτὸν τὸν Θεόν, ὡς ἀντιβαίνουσα πρὸς τὴν Λογικότητα τῶν *ὅλως κεχωρισμένων* οὐσιῶν καὶ ὄντοτήτων αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Καθαροῦ Πνεύματος (Ἀδημιουργήτου) ἀφ' ἑνός, κὰφ' ἑτέρου τῶν ἐξ ἄλλης, *οὐχὶ πνευματικῆς* οὐσίας, ὑλικῶν δεδημιουργημένων πραγμάτων! Εἰδάλλως, ἔχομεν *πανθεισμόν, πλήρη ἐκμηδένισιν* τῆς ἀξίας τοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἀγίου Προσώπου καὶ τοῦ τ' Ἀνθρώπου Θείου Προσώπου, καὶ *πλήρη ἀνασκολοπισμόν* ὡς καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ πολιτισμοῦ! Οὕτω *παντάπασι σαφές* γίγνεται ὅτι τὰ περὶ οὐσίας καὶ ὄντοτήτος Θεοῦ τε καὶ κόσμου προβλήματα *ἐστὶ τὰ πλέον θεμελιώδη* καὶ *οὐδεμία* περὶ τούτων ἐπιτρέπεται ἀδιαφορία ἢ *ψευδευσεβής* ἐλαφρότης παρὰ τῶν αὐτοθεωρουμένων μεμορφωμένων ("θεολόγων" καὶ ἄλλων): ἐνῶ ἐστὶ ἐξ ἴσου σαφές ὅτι ἡ καθαρὰ κλασσικὴ αὐτῶν "θεολογικὴ" καὶ "φιλοσοφικὴ" ἀντιμετώπισις *ἐστὶν ἄκρως ἀνεπαρκής* ὡς χη̇ *καθαρῶς θεωρητικὴ* τούτων "ἐπιστημονικὴ" *δῆθεν* ἐξέτασις στηριζομένη ἐφ' *ὑποθέσεων καθαρῶς ἀνθρωπίνων* δι' ὃ *ἐγγενῶς οὕτως αὕτη ἀδυνατεῖ* διαχωρίσαι τὴν συμβολὴν τῶν ὑποθέσεων τούτων ἀπὸ κείνης τῶν περὶ ἡμᾶς ἀντικειμένων πραγμάτων εἰς τὸ οὕτω περὶ Θεοῦ ἐπιτυγχανόμενον νεφελῶδες συμπέρασμα!

Καὶ *θεολογικῶς* ἐστὶν οὖν ἀπαραίτητον *ἐξευρεῖν ἄλλην* τῶν μέχρι τοῦδε καὶ *πείθουσιν* ὁδὸν μελέτης τοῦ συνολικοῦ τούτου περὶ τοῦ κόσμου προβλήματος. Ἐφ' ὅσον ἡ Οὐσία τοῦ Θεοῦ, διὰ τάγεφύρωτον ὄντολογικὸν χάσμα, οὐ προσφέρειθ' ὡς ἀντικείμενον μελέτης ἐν συνήθει ἐργαστηρίῳ διὰ τῶν συνήθων τῆς ἐπιστήμης μεθόδων, *κατ' ἀνάγκην* ἡ τοιαύτη μελέτη *χρη̇ ἐπεκταθῇ* ἐπὶ τοῦ κόσμου παντὸς δι' ἡμῶν *τρεπομένου εἰς ἐργαστήριον* (*not in a so-called academic "workshop"*), ὥστ' ἀπὸ *ταύτης* τῆς πλευρᾶς ἴδωμεν ποῖα *πείθοντα* συμπεράσματα δύναται ἐξαχθῆναι.

Οὐσιώδες ὡσαύτως ἐστὶ προσδιορίσαι τὶ δύναται συνιστάν' ἀπόδειξιν τῆς ὑπάρξεως τοῦ Θεοῦ πείθουσιν, ὥστ' ἐπὶ τέλους ἀπαλλαγώμεν τοῦ *δυσ-βαστάκτου βάρους* τῆς καθαρᾶς πίστεως· ἀναγκαίως μὲν εἰς προηγουμένης ἐποχᾶς ἐλλειποὺς γνώσεως, ἀλλὰ *νῦν ὅμως* δὲ κατὰ Λόγον ἐπιβαλλομένης μεταλλαχθῆναι εἰς ἀπόδειξιν ἐπιστημονικῶς ὡς ἐπ' ἀριστα πείθουσιν πρὸ τοῦ Τέλους· ἴν' ἐπὶ τέλους καταστή δυνατὴ ἡ Θεία Δικαιοσύνη!

Ὡς πρὸς μὲν τὴν ἀπόδειξιν, δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐπὶ τέλους κατανοητὸν πᾶσι πάντων ὅτι *κατ' οὐδέν* ἢ παροῦσα ἐποχὴ ὑστερεῖ πάσης προηγουμένης ἀλλ' ἀντιθέτως, ὅτι μόνον διὰ τὴν ἐπιστημονικὴν ἀπαιδευσίαν τῶν θεολογικῶς ἐν πολλοῖς *ψευδοφιλοσοφούντων* καὶ τὴν εἰς Θεὸν ἀπιστίαν τῶν ἐπιστημόνων ἀναγκάζονται καὶ οἱ μὲν καὶ οἱ δὲ καὶ πάντες εἰσέτι διδόναι ὕδωρ καὶ χορὴν, ἢ ψιλὴν περιφρόνησιν εἰς περὶ Θεοῦ ἀποδείξεως ἀντιλήψεις εὐτυχῶς ἀνεπιστρεπτὶ παρελθουσῶν ἐποχῶν [τινὲς τῶν ὁποίων μετὰ πολλοῦ κόπου εἰσήχθησαν ἐν Ἑλλάδι, ὅπου ἡ βαθεῖα σύγχρονος γνώσις περὶ τὰ τρέχοντα ἐπιστημονικὰ πράγματα τῶν μὲν ἐνταῦθα "φιλοσοφούντων" *μονίμως* καθυστερεῖ, τοῦ δὲ κλήρου ἀπ' αἰώνων οὐδόλως πλέον φιλοσοφούντος (ἀλλὰ μόνον δι' ἀποσθηθήσεως ἀναμασσωμένου τὰ παλαιῶθεν γνωστὰ ἀλλ' οὐχὶ πάντοτε καὶ ὀρθά) καὶ πεισμόνως ἀρνούμενου μαθάνειν τι νέον ἐστὶ πλέον ὅλως ἀνύπαρκτος]! Ἐστὶν ἤδη σαφές καὶ καταστήσεται ἐν συνεχείᾳ σαφέστατον ὅτι τὰ ὧδε συζητούμενα οὐδεμίαν ἔχουσι σχέσιν πρὸς τὰς μεσαιωνικὰς "ἀποδείξεις" ἢ ἀπὸ "καθαροῦ" δῆθεν λόγου Καντιανᾶς συζητήσεις· πάσας νῦν ἀπλῶς καλουμένας "ἐνδείξεις"· ὥς ἡ καθ' ἡμᾶς δῆθεν "Ὁρθόδοξος Ἀνατολή" ἀπλῶς θεωρεῖ θεολογικῶς ἀστήρικτα εἰ μὴ καὶ παντελῶς ἐσφαλμένα "Δυτικὰ" ἀξιοπερίεργα, οὐδόλως συναισθανομένη τὴν ἀπ' αἰώνων *ιδίαν βαρεῖαν ἀμέλειαν* μελέτης τῶν κειμένων πραγμάτων· ἐφ' ὅσον, τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσέτι ἀναμένοντος παρὰ τὰς τῶν ἀνθρώπων βαρυτάτας κατ' Αὐτοῦ ὕβρεις, τὸ εἰς αὐτοὺς προσιτὸν τμήμα τῆς Θείας Σοφίας οὐδόλως πῶς ἐξηντλήθη, *κάπι τούτῳ μόνῳ* ὑπάρχει ἐλπίς πείσαι τινὰς ἐξ ἡμῶν διὰ τὴν ἀγάπην πρὸς τοὺς ὁποίους ὁ Θεὸς δέχεται ὑπομονητικῶς τὰς τῶν πολλῶν βλασφημίας! ["Ἄν δ' οἱ "Ὁρθόδοξοι" ἀντείπωσιν τι εἰς ταῦτα, τοῦτ' αὐτοὺς χρὴ ἀπαντήσαι πρὸ παντὸς ἄλλου: Τί κατὰ τὴν γνώμην αὐτῶν εἰσέτι συγκρατεῖ τὸν Θεὸν καὶ Κεῖνος οὐκ ἐπιφέρει τὸ Τέλος; Διότι οὐδὲν αὐτοὶ πράττουσι διὰ πίστεως ὥστ' ἦττον ποιήσουσι τὸ κατένωπα τοῦ Θεοῦ μέγεθος τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ἀναισχυντίας· εἰς ὃ οἱ "νεοέλληνες" ὁπωσδήποτε προστιθέασιν νέα ἀναίσχυντα ιδιῶνυμα ἀδικήματα!] Ἡ πλήρης ἐλλειψὶς συναισθήσεως παρὰ τῶν "Ὁρθόδοξων" τῶν ἐγγενῶν ἰδίων ὑποχρεώσεων ἔναντι τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκ τῶν ὧδε ἀναπτυσσομένων θεμάτων, ἐξ αἰτίας τῆς χρήσεως καὶ μόνης τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτῶν τούτου, *ἥδη συνιστᾷ βαρυτάτην κατὰ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος βλασφημίαν!!!* Τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν ἀνθρώπων συνεπιφέρουσι βαρυτάτας εὐθύνας! Ἀλλὰ μόνον ἄπιστοι παραμένουσιν ἀσυγκίνητοι περὶ ταῦτα!

Πρὸς δὲ τὸ περὶ Θείας Δικαιοσύνης, σαφές ἐστίν ὅτι εἰ ὁ Θεὸς κατεσκεύασε μὲν τὸν κόσμον, οὐχὶ ὅμως τοιοῦτον ὥστ' ἐγγενῶς *κάκαταμαχί-τως* ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποδεικνύναι τὴν Ἐαυτοῦ ὕπαρξιν ὡς τοῦ Δημιουργοῦ αὐτοῦ, τόθ' ὁ Θεὸς εἴτ' ἐστὶν ἄσοφος καὶ παραλογίζεται, εἴτ' ἐστὶ σαδιστὴς παρο-ρῶν χῶλως ἀδιαφορῶν διὰ τοὺς ἐξ ἡμῶν καλοπίστως ἀπαιτοῦντας τῆς Αὐ-

τοῦ ὑπάρξεως ἀπόδειξιν βάσιμον! Ἡ σωτηρία τῆς ἀνθρώπου ψυχῆς οὐκ ἐστὶ "λαχεῖον" τῆς ψυχολογικῆς αὐτοῦ κατασκευῆς καὶ εὐπειθείας, ἢ τῆς "κακῆς" αὐτοῦ τύχης μορφωθῆναι καὶ δικαίως διὰ τοῦτ' ἀπαιτεῖν ἐπιχειρήματα *Λογικά!* Ἀποτελεῖ βλασφημίαν κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὰνθρώπου ὅτι κληρικοί τε καὶ "θεολόγοι" οὐδόλως πως συναισθάνονται ὅτι ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐστὶ τὰ τάλαντα τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἐν οἷς ἡ πλήρης μόρφωσις πρώτιστον, καὶ παρεκτρέπονται ἀνεπιτρέπτως προσπαθοῦντες μηδενίσαι κυρίως τὸ τάλαντον τῆς τοιαύτης μορφώσεως, ὥστε δι' ἀνεπιτρέπτου ἐπιβολῆς, ὁρμωμένης ἀπὸ τῆς ἰδίας αὐτῶν ἀπιστίας, σιγάσαι ὥς καὶ σπουδαῖα προβλήματα πέραν ὅσων παρελθούσαι γενεαὶ ἔσχον τὴν δυνατότητα, μέσα, σοφίαν ἢ ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐμπνευσιν ἐπιλῦσαι, καὶ πέραν ὅσων οἱ ἴδιοι, πεισματικῶς παραμείναντες μακρὰν ὀπισθεν τοῦ σὺν Θεῷ πρὸς τὸ Τέλος θέοντος χρόνου, συνεχῶς ἀναμασῶσιν ἐν ταῖς μὴ πλέον συγχρόνοις πανεπιστημιακαῖς καὶ ἄλλαις "θεολογικαῖς" τῶν σχολαῖς! Ἀλλ' ἐπίσης, διότι τὸ μέγιστον κακὸν συντελεῖται ἀπὸ θέσεως κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν πλησίεστατα μὲν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ὅμως δ' οὐσιωδῶς ἀπὸ κείνης διάφορον περὶ τὰ σπουδαιότατα, δηλαδὴ ἀσφαλῶς κρυπτόμενοι ἐν τῇ αἴγλῃ τῆς, ὅπερ τυγχάνει γνωστὸν τοῖς πονηροτάτοις καὶ πλήρους ἐκμεταλλεύσεως παρ' αὐτῶν, ἀλλ' ἄγνωστον τοῖς ἀφελοῖς, διὰ τοῦτο ὁ πάνσοφος Θεὸς ἀπογυμνῶσει ἀπ' ἐντὸς τούτου τοῦ κόσμου, δηλαδὴ δι' ἡμῶν, τοὺς πρώτους ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ Φωτὸς αἴγλης, ἀλλὰ μόνον ἐὰν παύσωσιν ὑπάρχειν ἀφελεῖς τινες, κατ' ἐλάχιστον! Μόνον ὅτ' ἐν πλήρει ἐπιγνώσει τῆς ὑπάρξεως τοῦ Θεοῦ συντελεῖται παρανομία συντελεῖται καὶ τὸ μέγιστον τῶν κακῶν! Οὕτω μόνον καὶ τὸ μέγιστον κακὸν ἐπιτελεῖται χυπάρχει ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἐκτελέσει αὐτοῦ ἢ πλήρης ἐπίγνωσις τῆς ἐπιτελουμένης παρανομίας! "Αὐτὸν ἐστὶ στοιχεῖ ἀπαραίτητ' ἀποδόσεως τῆς Θείας Δικαιοσύνης, ἥτις οὐκ ἐπιβλήθησεται ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων δικτατορικῶς κατὰ τὰ γνωστὰ παρ' ἡμῖν, ἀλλὰ δικαίως κατὰ τὴν ἡμῶν ἰδίαν κατάγνωσιν! Ἐάν τις διάφορον ἔχη γνώμην, ἀσφαλῶς δικαιῶνται αὐτῆς· ἀλλὰ πάντως ὀφείλει γιγνώσκειν ὅτι περὶ ἐλάσσοις "Θεοῦ" ὁμιλεῖ καὶ "θεολογεῖ", ὅτι συνεπῶς κενὴ καὶ μὴ σεβαστὴ ἐστὶν ἡ γνώμη αὐτοῦ, χῶτι μόνον διὰ νίκας κατ' ἀχυνανθρώπου σεμνύνεται ἂν πως νικήσῃ αὐτόν! Τῆς κατὰ Χριστὸν πρώτης μεγάλης ἐντολῆς οὔσης "ἀγαπήσεις Κύριον τὸν Θεὸν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου", ἢ αὐθαίρετος κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν (εἰ καὶ ὅλην) καὶ τμήμα μόνον (οὐχὶ τὸ πλήρες) τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ ἰσχύος, οὐδόλως δὲ καὶ καθ' ὅλην τὴν ἐκάστου ἡμῶν διάνοιαν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἐπιδεικνυμένη, ἢ ὑπὸ τῶν κληρικῶν (διὰ τῆς προσπαθείας τῶν μειώσεως τῆς ἀξίας τῆς εἰς αὐτοὺς μὴ ἀρεστῆς μορφώσεως) ἐπιβαλλομένη, "ἀγάπη" ἀποτελεῖ μίαν ἔτι βλάσφημον (εἰ καὶ "θεολογικῶς" διατυπωμένην) προσπάθειαν ἐξαπατήσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν δικαίως εἰς Αὐτὸν ἀνηκόντων! Ἀλήθεια ὧν ὁ Θεός, τὴν ἀλήθειαν οὐ φοβεῖται! Οἱ δειλοὶ μόνον!

Πὼς ἡ Τούτου ἀνεύρεσις ἐπιτυγχάνεται.

Ἐκ πασῶν τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἐπιστημῶν, μία ἐστὶν ἡ ὅλως ἀμάχητος: Τῶν κλασσικῶν μαθηματικῶν! Πᾶς αἱ λοιπαὶ πάσχουσιν ἐξ αἰτίας τῆς ἀνα-

κριβείας καὶ μὴ πάντοτε σταθερᾶς χρήσεως καὶ σημασίας τῶν λέξεων! Αἱ δι' ἀνθρωπίνων μόνων λόγων περὶ Θεοῦ, μὴ ἀπτοῦ ὄντος, "συζητήσεις" εἰσὶν οὖν ἐγγενῶς διπλῶς ἀνακριβεῖς! Οὐδὲ αἱ εἰς αὐθεντίας ἀναφοραί, ἰδίως παρελθουσῶν ἐποχῶν, σφῶνσιν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐγγενῶν ἀοριστιῶν! Τὸ "τάδε κείνος ἔφα, σὺ δὲ σίγα!" ἔστι ψευδεπιχείρημα, ἂν οὐδεμία ὑπάρχη ἀπόδειξις ὅτι κάπὶ τῷ παρόντι νῦν συζητουμένῳ προβλήματι ταῦτά φῆσαι ἂν "κείνος"! Οὐδεμία τοιαύτη περὶ τὰ μαθηματικά ὑπάρχει ἀμφιβολία! Τὸ "ἐν συν ἐνὶ ποιεῖ δύο", τὸ αὐτὸ αἰεὶ ἦν, νῦν ἐστὶ, καὶ αἰεὶ ἐσται· χόλως ἀνεξάρτητον τῶν ἀνθρώπων! Τὰ κλασσικὰ μαθηματικά κατανοοῦνται μονοσημάντως παρὰ πάντων· ὅπερ οὐ συμβαίνει αἰεὶ ἐν ταῖς συνηθέσι γλώσσαις ἀνθρώπων! Συνεπῶς, μόνον ἂν διὰ τῶν μαθηματικῶν δηλωθῇ ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ παρουσία, καθίσταται αὕτη ἀμάχητος!

Ἄλλὰ πῶς κὰν τῷ φυσικῷ "ἐκεῖ ἔξω" κόσμῳ; Πρὸς τοῦτ' ἀπαιτεῖτ' ἐπιβολὴ τις ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς φύσεως, ἔσθωθεν μὲν αὐτῆς ὅλως ἀδύνατος κᾶρ' ἔξωθεν αὐτῆς ἐπιβληθεῖσα, πλήρως δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ φυσικῶς καὶ λογικῶς λειτουργοῦσα, τουτέστιν ἐξ ἴσου ἀδιαμφισβήτητος κἀμάχητος παρὰ πάντων! Πῶς ἡ δυσκολωτάτη αὕτη παραγγελία; Ἀδύνατον διαφυγεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ (νῦν ἀπλῶς θεωρουμένου ὄντος, τελείου, πανσόφου καὶ τῆς φύσεως δημιουργοῦ) ὅτι εἰς κόσμον δημιουργουμένη ἡ φύσις εἰς ἀπλοῦς, μονοσημάντους, σαφεῖς, ἀλλήλους συμπληροῦντας, οὐδέποτε ἀλλήλους ἀντικρούοντας, μαθηματικῶς διατετυπωμένους νόμους αἰεὶ δεῖ αὐτὴν ὑπακούειν ἵνα μηδέποτε περιέλθῃ εἰς σύγχυσιν ἐπὶ τῇ ἐκτελέσει τοῦ κείνῃ δεδομένου καθήκοντος! Οὕτως, ἂν ἡμεῖς εὐρωμεν τοιοῦτους φυσικοὺς νόμους καὶ καταδείξωμεν τὰδύνατον τῆς αὐτῶν ἀπ' ἐντὸς τῆς φύσεως συλλήψεως καὶ ἐπιβολῆς, καὶ βεβαιώσωμεν τὸ αὐτῶν ἀνεξάρτητον ἀπὸ πάσης ἀμφιβόλου ὑποθέσεως τῶν ἀνθρώπων, τότε ἀσφαλῶς οὐχὶ μόνον ὀδηγησόμεθ' εἰς λύσιν πασῶν τῶν περὶ τὸ φυσικὸν σύμπαν ὑπαρχουσῶν ἐπιστημονικῶν ἀποριῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τὸ ἐπιστημονικῶς καὶ λογικῶς ἀδιαμφισβήτητον πλεον συμπεράσμα ὅτι ταῦτα πάντα πράγματι συνιστάσι οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἢ τὴν ζητουμένην ἀπόδειξιν τῆς ὑπάρξεως τοῦ ταῦτα πάντα ἐπιβαλόντος!

Φρονῶ ὅτι κατὰ τὸ "ἀεροστεγῶς" συλλογίζεσθαι οὕτως οὐδὲν διέφυγε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν δυσκολιῶν τοῦ ὁποίου ἡδυνάμην ἂν κατηγορηθῇν· ὅτι σκοπίμως διὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ παραλείψεως ὑπεξέφυγα! Οὕτω δικαιούμαι (ἤτοι οὐχί γε ἀπλῶς μόνος ἐγὼ ἀλλὰ πᾶς ὁμοίως διατυπῶν τοῦτο τὸ πρόβλημα) ἀναμένειν ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν πρὸς ταῦτα πάντ' ἀντιτίθεσθ' ἐπιθυμούντων ἀναλόγως τιμίαν ἀπόκρισιν! Τὸ πρόβλημ' ἐστὶν εὐθέως πρὸς τοῦτο ἀνάλογον: Ἔστιν ἢ οὐ πῖναξ ζωγραφικὸς τις γνήσιον δημιούργημα τοῦ δημιουργοῦ 'του; Δικαιούμεθα καὶ ὑποχρεούμεθ' ἄρ' οὖν, ναὶ ἢ οὐ, ἀπὸ τοῦ πῖνακος συναγαγεῖν τὸν δημιουργόν 'του; Ὡς ἔτι καὶ ἂν παρέμεινεν ἀνυπόγραφος; Ἔστιν ἢ ὑπογραφή "L. da Vinci", ἢ "Θεός", ἢ συνιστῶσ' ἀπόδειξιν γνησιότητος, ἢ μᾶλλον αὕτη τοῦ ἔργου ἢ ὑπαρξὶς χῆ ὅλη τούτου ποιότης ὑφ' ἑνα παντάπασιν Λογικὸν Νόμον; Ἐὰν ὑμεῖς ὑπογράψετε τὸ ἐπόμενον ὑμῶν ἔργον διὰ τοῦ "Θεός", ἄρ' ἀναγνωρισθήσεσθ' ὡς Ἐκεῖνος; Ἀπλᾶ ἐρωτήματα! Ὡς ἐπίσης ἔστιν ἀπλοῦν ὅτι μόνον ἢ ὡς ἄνω αὐστηροτάτη ἀπαίτησις, ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ δημιουργίᾳ ὑπογραφὴν συνιστῶσα διάχυτον, συνιστᾷ τὴν ἀπαι-

τουμένην ἀπόδειξιν τῆς γνησιότητος τοῦ κόσμου παντὸς ὡς ἔργου αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ!

“Ὅτ’ ἀπὸ τηλεφώνου ἠρώτησα τί ἐθεωρεῖτ’ ἂν ἀπόδειξιν ἱκανήν, ὑμεῖς ἐγελάσατε λέγων ὅτι οὐχ ὑπάρχει τοιαύτη ἀπόδειξις! Θεωρῶ ὅτι ἐν εἰλικρινείᾳ ἀπηντήσατε, μηδέποτ’ ἐπὶ τοῦ θέματος προβληματισθεῖς ὡς *αὐστηρὸς* ἐπιστήμων καὶ δοκῶν τελεσίδικον ὡς *πραγματικὴν* [ἀπὸ μόνου τοῦ *νῦν ἐλλειποῦς καταδεικνυμένου τρόπου τῆς μέχρι τοῦδε ἐρεύνης* τῶν “ἐπαγγελματικῶς” (*ὑποτίθεται*) ἐγκυψάντων ἐπὶ τοῦ προβλήματος *οὐχί γε ἀπὸ τῶν συμπαντικῶν ἀντικειμένων πραγμάτων*] τὴν *ἀδυναμίαν* τῆς ἀποφάνσεως, ὑπὲρ ἢ κατὰ! Νῦν ἐστὶ πλέον καιρὸς καὶ τοῦτο ἀπαντηθῆναι: Πρὸς τὰ παρόντα συγκρινόμεν’ *ἅπασ’* αἱ προηγηθεῖσαι *λεγόμεναι* “συζητήσεις”, τίς ἐστὶν ἀφελέστερα, ταῦτα ἢ κεῖναι; Τί ἐν τοῖς παροῦσι καλῶς κρίνεθ’ ὡς ἀφελές; Εἰ δὲ ταῦτα πάντα *συμπαγῇ* συνίστησι λόγον, πῶς οὐχὶ *ὅλως διάφορον* τῆς πρὸς ἐκείνας δεῖ νῦν εἶναι τὴν πρὸς *ταῦτα* ἀπόκρισιν; “Ὅτε *ὑμεῖς*, καὶ δὴ *ἀγωνιωδῶς*, δηλοῦτε “ἄπιστος”, πράγματι ἀφελὴς ἐγὼ ἦν ἂν, εἰ ἐθεώρουν ὑμᾶς δι’ ἐλαφρότητος ὀδηγηθέντα εἰς τὴν ὑφ’ ὑμῶν *πιστευομένην* “ἀπιστίαν” ὑμῶν! Ὁ δίκαιος καὶ τὰς καρδίας καὶ νεφροὺς ἐτάζων Μέγας Θεὸς *ἄλλως* ἀληθῶς κρίνει· οὐχὶ ὡς οἱ μέχρι τοῦδε θύραθεν *ἄθεοι* “θεολόγοι” τε καὶ “φιλόσοφοι” οἱ διὰ τῆς *ἀπιστίας* αὐτῶν (ἀποδεικνυμένης διὰ τοῦ *παρὰ λόγου αὐτῶν τρόπου* διαχειρίσεως τοῦ καθ’ ὅλα *Λογικοῦ* προβλήματος τοῦ Θεοῦ—οὐ γὰρ ἐδύναντ’ ἂν ἄλλως ποιῆσαι τὸν Θεὸν καὶ Ὁρθὸν Λόγον καταλιπόντες *κοῦχί καὶ διὰ τῆς διανοίας αὐτῶν ὅλης* Αὐτὸν ἀγαπήσαντες) ξηρὰν ὕδατος καταλιπόντες τὴν γλῶσσαν ὑμῶν καταφαγόντος τὰς αὐτῶν συγγραφάς (ἢ δεῖ μ’ ἄρα λέγειν τὰς ἀπ’ ἀλλήλων αὐτῶν *συρραφάς*;)! Ἀσφαλῶς κἀγὼ ἀμαρτωλὸς ὢν λίαν, *τρέμω* πρὸ τοῦ δικαίου Θεοῦ, ἀλλ’ ἀφεθεῖς ἐπ’ Αὐτῷ, οὐκ ἀπέκαμον ἐλπίζων ἐπὶ τῷ Χριστοῦ λόγῳ “καθαρὰ τῇ καρδίᾳ αἰτεῖτε, καὶ *δοθήσετε* ὑμῖν”! Διὰ τοῦτο οὐ κατὰ τὰ αὐτῶν ἔργα διεπορεύθη: “δεσμεύουσι γὰρ φορτία βάρεα... καὶ ἐπιτιθέασιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὦμους τῶν ἀνθρώπων, τῷ δὲ δακτύλῳ αὐτῶν οὐ θέλουσι [δι’ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν] κινήσαι αὐτά. ...τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν ποιοῦσι πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι..., φιλοῦσι πρωτοκλισίαν ἐν δείπνοις καὶ πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν συναγωγαῖς καὶ [χειρῶν] ἀσπασμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς καὶ καλεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων *ραββὶ ραββί*! ὑμεῖς δέ, *μὴ κληθῆτε ραββί..., καὶ πατέρα μὴ καλέσητε ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς..., μὴδὲ κληθῆτε καθηγηταί...!*” (Ματθ. κγ 3-10). Φοβεροὶ ὄντως λόγοι· *οὕς πάντας κατεπιγινώστω* οἱ μεγαλόσχημοι καθηγηταὶ κάρχιερεῖς τῶν λαῶν *κατεπάτησαν*, αὐτοὺς σκανδαλίζοντες! Περὶ Θεοῦ ὁμιλῶ, καὶ σὺν Ἐκείνῳ τὴν Ἐκείνου ὑπαρξιν ἀποδείκνυμι, ἀλλὰ πολὺ μᾶλλον σὺν ὑμῖν ἢ ἐκείνοις αἰσθάνομαι καὶ μᾶλλον τῆς *τιμίας* ὑμῶν ἢ κείνων *ζήλοφθόνου* κρίσεως ἐξαιτούμαι, τοὺς δυσκολωτάτους ἀντιπάλους ἀναζητῶν ἢ ἀνθρώπους μαλακάς, ἡρωματισμένας καὶ πρὸς τὸ φιλεῖσθαι ἐκτεταμένας ἔχοντας τὰς δεξιὰς αὐτῶν χεῖρας!

Τὰ ἐπιστημονικὰ μέσα τῆς ἀνευρέσεως.

Ἡ ἀνεύρεσις διακηρύσσεται κατ’ *ἀκαταμάχητον ἀπόδειξιν ὑπάρξεως αὐστηροτάτων ἀλληλεξηρημένων* μαθηματικῶν νόμων συνεχόντων τὸ σύμ-

παν! Οὐχὶ κατ' ἀμφίβολον ἀνθρωπίνην ὑπόθεσιν ἢ θεωρίαν, ἀλλὰ κατ' ἀνά-
λυσιν τῶν ἀριθμητικῶν ἀποτελεσμάτων ἤδη παραδεδεγμένων μετρήσεων!
Ἀρχομένων ἀπὸ κείνων αὐτοῦ τοῦ (θρυλουμένου) διὰ τῆς βαρύτητος κατα-
πεσόντος ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ Νεύτωνος κεφαλῆς μήλου! Πράγματι:

—Παρά πάντα τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ **Einstein** ὑποστηριχθέντα, οὐδεμία ὑπάρχει
ἀτέλεια εἰς τὸν τοῦ **Newton** βαρύτητος νόμον!

—Ἡ περὶ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ **Newton** κρίσις τοῦ **Einstein** ὠφέιλετο εἰς τὴν
ἀποτυχίαν τῶν ἐπιστημόνων κατανοῆσαι ὅτι ἵνα καταστή ἀπόλυτος ἡ ἐφαρ-
μογὴ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ **Newton**, ἀπαιτεῖται ὡσαύτως ἕτερος συμπληρωματι-
κὸς νόμος προσδιορίζων ἐπακριβῶς τὴν φυσικὴν, οὐχὶ τὴν ὑποτιθεμένην
κατὰ τὴν Εὐκλείδειον γεωμετρίαν εὐθείαν ἀπόστασιν μεταξὺ τῶν ἔλκομέ-
νων σωμάτων!

—Ἡ θεωρουμένη "ἀτέλεια" τοῦ νόμου τῆς Νευτωνείου βαρύτητος, "δια-
πιστουμένη" ἐκ τῆς **precession of the orbits of the planets**, ἐξαφανίζεται
ὅταν ἀντὶ τῆς κατ' εὐθείαν γραμμὴν ἀποστάσεως ληφθῇ ἡ ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου
τῆς βαρύτητος διατασσομένη τοιαύτη κατὰ τὴν τροχίαν τοῦ φωτός, καὺ-
τοῦ ἐγγενῶς ἔχοντος ἀκριβῶς τὴν αὐτῆς μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν πάντων σωμά-
των ποιότητος μᾶζαν, καὶ ὡς καὺτοῦ ἐπηρεαζομένου ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐν
τῷ σύμπαντι ὄντων σωμάτων, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ πλέον κατ' ἐπιταγὴν θεωρίας τινὸς
ὡς ἡ τῆς γενικῆς σχετικότητος!

—Τὸ περίφημον πείραμα τῶν **Michelson & Morley** (τὸ διαπιστώσαν τὴν
ἀνυπαρξίαν τοῦ "αἰθέρος") ἐσφαλμένης ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἔτυχεν ἐρμηνείας! Ἡ ὀρ-
θὴ ἐρμηνεία καὶ τὴν ἀνυπαρξίαν τοῦ "αἰθέρος" βεβαίῳ καὶ τὸ ὅλως ἀνυπό-
στατον τῆς ἐν τῇ φύσει ἐφαρμογῆς τῆς εἰδικῆς θεωρίας τοῦ **Einstein**: ἐπὶ
πλέον δὲ ἀποδείκνυσι τὴν ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς μάζης κατασκευὴν τῶν συνήθων
σωμάτων καὶ τοῦ φωτός!

—Αἱ θεωροῦμαι φυσικαὶ ἀποδείξεις τῆς θεωρίας τῆς γενικῆς σχετικό-
τητος ἀποδείκνυνται φυσικαὶ ἀπόρροιαι τοῦ ἐκ μάζης συγκειμένου φωτός,
κοὺ ἀπαιτοῦσι διὰ τὴν αὐτῶν ἐρμηνείαν τὴν θεωρίαν αὐτήν!

—Ἡ περίφημος διαστολὴ τοῦ σύμπαντος οὐδόλως σχετίζεται πρὸς τὴν
γενικὴν σχετικότητα, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ἀπότοκος αὐτοῦ τούτου τοῦ κατὰ τὸν Νεύ-
τωνα τῆς βαρύτητος νόμου, τῆς ἀπολύτου σταθερότητος τῆς συνολικῆς τοῦ
σύμπαντος μάζης καὶ τῆς ἀπολύτου σταθερότητος τῆς "παγκοσμίου σταθε-
ρᾶς τῆς βαρύτητος": περὶ ὧν πάντων ἡ ὅλη θεωρία τῆς σχετικότητος ἀπο-
λύτως οὐδὲν ἔχει λέγειν!

—Τὸ σύμπαν ἔστι πεπερασμένον, σφαιρικόν, ἡ ἀκτίς 'του διαστέλλεται
μετὰ τῆς ταχύτητος τοῦ φωτός, καὶ ἡ ἐσωτερικὴ 'του διαστολὴ ἔστιν ἀνά-
λογος πρὸς τὴν τοπικὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ κέντρου ἀπόστασιν!

—Ἡ ταχύτης τοῦ φωτός καὶ διαστολῆς ἔστι μεταβλητὴ, ἀρξαμένη ἀπὸ
τῆς τιμῆς τοῦ ἀπείρου κατὰ τὴν μηδενικὴν στιγμὴν τῆς Δημιουργίας (καθ'
ἣν ἤρξατο μετρούμενος καὶ ὁ μόνος ἡμῖν γνωστὸς φυσικὸς χρόνος): καὶ
διὰ ταύτης μόνον ἦν τῷ διαστελλομένῳ σύμπαντι δυνατόν διαφυγεῖν ἀπὸ
τοῦ μηδενικοῦ μαθηματικοῦ σημείου τοῦ κέντρου καὶ φυσικοῦ τόπου τῆς
Δημιουργίας αὐτοῦ) καπὸ τῆς ἐπίσης ἀπείρου τιμῆς τῆς παγκοσμίου βαρύ-
τητος κατὰ τὸν χρόνον μηδέν!

–Αί βάσει τῶν νόμων αὐτῶν ὑπολογιζόμεναι τιμαὶ μέσης πυκνότητος καὶ συνολικῆς ποσότητος τῆς ἐν τῷ σύμπαντι μάζης συμφωνοῦσι στενότερα μετὰ τῶν διὰ κοπιωδεστάτων ἀστρονομικῶν μετρήσεων ὑπολογιζομένων! Ἀντιθέτως, ἡ θεωρία τῆς σχετικότητος πλήρως *ἀδυνατεῖ* σαφές τι δηλῶσαι περὶ αὐτῶν!

–Ἡ ἐν τῷ σύμπαντι τοπικὴ μάζης πυκνότης ἔστι τοιαύτη ὥστε διασφαλίζειν *σταθεράν* (ἥτοι *συμπαντικοῦ τόπου ἀνεξάρτητον*) *τὴν στιγμιαίαν τιμὴν ταχύτητος τοῦ φωτός!* Καὶ ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ σπουδαιοτάτου ἀντικειμένου, ἡ θεωρία τῆς σχετικότητος ἀπολύτως *οὐδὲν* ἔχει λέγειν!

–Ἡ ἀπροσδιοριστία τοῦ **Einstein** (ἥτοι ἡ *θρυλουμένη δῆθεν* ἐγγενὴς ἀδυναμία προσδιορισμοῦ ἀπολύτου χρόνου, συμβάντων προτεραιότητος κἀκριβῶν ἀποστάσεων) ἀποδείκνυται παντελῶς ἀνυπόστατος ἐκ τῆς διὰ τῶν νόμων τούτων διαπιστουμένης *θεμελιώδους λειτουργίας* τῆς ἡλικίας τοῦ σύμπαντος προσδιορίζουσας *κοινὸν χρόνον μηδέν* διὰ τὸ συνολικὸν ἐν τῇ γενέσει αὐτοῦ ὑλικὸν σύμπαν!

–Ἡ σχετικιστικὴ φυσικὴ *δῆθεν* δυνατότης μεταπηδήσεως ἐν χρόνῳ (κατὰ *παράβασιν* δηλαδὴ τῆς συνήθους τοῦ χρόνου ροῆς) ἀποδείκνυται *καθαρότατον μῦθευμα!*

–Ἡ διαστολὴ τοῦ σύμπαντος καὶ αἱ τροχιαὶ τῶν πλανητῶν κατὰ **Kepler** ἀποδείκνυνται ὑποκείμεναι τῷ αὐτῷ μαθηματικῷ νόμῳ σχέσεως μήκους πρὸς χρόνον!

Ταῦτα δὲ πάντα, **παρακαλῶ σημειώσατε**, ἀποκαλυπτόμενα διὰ *κατὰ πάντα προσεκτικῆς* διαστασιακῆς ἀναλύσεως (ὑπὸ τῶν καθηγητῶν φυσικῆς καὶ ἀστρονομίας παντελῶς περιφρονηθείσης ὡς *ἀγνώστου καίτοι ὑποχρεωτικῆς αὐτοῖς πᾶσιν* ὡς μετὰ μεγίστης καταπλήξεως διεπίστωσα) τοῦ νόμου τῆς Νευτωνείου βαρύτητος, **οὐχὶ δι’ αὐθαιρέτου τινὸς θεωρίας!** Ἡ διαστασιακὴ ὡς ἄνω ἀνάλυσις ἐπιτρέπει ὁκτῶ δυνατοὺς πρὸς ἄλληλα συνδυασμοὺς τῶν **G, M, V, D** καὶ **T** (ὄντων ἀντιστοίχως τῆς σταθερᾶς τῆς βαρύτητος, τῆς συνολικῆς μάζης, τοῦ συνολικοῦ ὄγκου, τῆς μέσης πυκνότητος μάζης, καὶ τῆς ἡλικίας τοῦ σύμπαντος), ἐξ ὧν *λεπτομερῶς ἐξεταζόμενοι* οἱ ἐπτὰ ἀπορρίπτονται, εἴτ’ ἐξ ἐνυπαρχουσῶν ἀντινομιῶν, εἴτ’ ἐξ ἀσυμφωνίας πρὸς τὰς μέχρι τοῦδ’ ἀκριβεστάτας ἀστρονομικὰς γενομένας παρατηρήσεις, εἴτ’ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων! Κέκτημαι ὀγκώδη ἀλληλογραφίαν μετὰ καθηγητῶν καὶ κατόχων τοῦ βραβείου **Nobel** καταδεικνύσαν τὴν διὰ παντοίων πλαγίων τρόπων προσπάθειαν ὑπεκφυγῆς αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῆς εὐθύνης δημοσίας ὁμολογίας, ἣν μόνοι τινὲς αὐτῶν προφορικῶς μοι ὡμολόγησαν διὰ τοῦ μὴ εὑρεῖν τι ψέξει ἐν τῷ ὅλῳ συλλογισμῷ, καὶ τῆς δικαιολογίας ὅτι καὶ οὗτοι ἔχουσιν διπλᾶς ὑποθήκας ἐπὶ τῶν ιδίῳν κατοικιῶν (κᾶρ’ ἀδυνατοῦσι συγκρουσθῆναι μετὰ τῆς κακῶς ἐγκαθεστηκυίας ἀκαδημαϊκῆς **ἀταξίας** πραγμάτων!

Ἐπὶ *πλέον* δὲ πάντων τῶν ἀνωτέρω, ἡ **quantum theory** τίθεται ἐπὶ βάσεως ὅλως νέας καὶ ἀπλουστάτης, ἡ ὁποία διὰ τῆς *γενικῆς ἐρμηνείας* τῆς πηθώρας τῶν ἀριθμητικῶν ἀποτελεσμάτων τῶν φασμάτων ἀπορροφήσεως τῶν ἀτόμων (**atomic absorption spectra**) ἐκτὸς πολλῶν ἄλλων ἥσσονος σημασίας πραγμάτων:

–'Αποδείκνυσι θεμελιωδῶς ἐσφαλμένην καὶ τὴν ἀρχικὴν θεωρίαν τοῦ Bohr καὶ τὴν καλουμένην "νέαν" τοιαύτην!

–Αἶρει πάσας τὰς ἐγγενεῖς Λογικὰς καὶ γεωμετρικὰς ἀδυναμίας τῆς ἀποδεδεγμένης νῦν θεωρίας!

–Παρουσιάζει πλήρη τὸν γεωμετρικῶς ὀρθὸν καὶ ἐνιαῖον νόμον τῆς ἠλεκτρονικῆς δομῆς τῶν ἀτόμων ὅλων τῶν χημικῶν στοιχείων. [Κατὰ τὰ νῦν παραδεδεγμένα, οὐδεὶς τοιοῦτος νόμος πιστεύεθ' ὑπάρχων, ἢ δυνάμενος ὑπάρξει· ὥστε αὕτη αὕτη ἡ ἀνακάλυψις τοιοῦτου νόμου καταρρίπτει τὴν ὅλην αὐτὴν θεωρίαν!]

–'Αποδείκνυσι τὸν νόμον δομῆς τῶν ἀτόμων ἐμπεριέχοντα γνώσιν τῶν ἀπολύτων (cardinal) καὶ τακτικῶν (ordinal) ἀριθμῶν, ὥστε καὶ τὴν ἐλαχίστην δρᾶσιν ἐπενεργεῖν κατὰ τὰ ὥς ἄνω φυσικά (οὐχὶ αὐθαιρέτως ἐπινοηθέντα ὡς ἐν τῇ νῦν ἀποδεδεγμένῃ θεωρίᾳ) quanta, καὶ τὰς δράσεις τῶν ἐντὸς τῶν ἀτόμων ἠλεκτρονίων ὀρίζεσθαι κατὰ τὴν γεωμετρικὴν τούτων ἐν τοῖς ἀτόμοις διάταξιν, περὶ ᾧν ἡ κρατοῦσα νῦν θεωρία ἀπολύτως οὐδὲν ἔχει λέγειν κρυπτομένη ὀπισθεν τῆς κατὰ Heisenberg ἀπροσδιοριστίας!

–Διαλύει παντελῶς τὸν μῦθον τῆς ἀπροσδιοριστίας τοῦ Heisenberg, ὃν ἀντικαθιστᾷ διὰ τοῦ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν ἀγνοηθέντος φυσικοῦ νόμου τῆς ἐλαχίστης ἐν τῇ φύσει ἐντὸς ὁρίων δυνατῆς δράσεως· ἀποτελεσματικῶς μὲν αὐτοῦ προστατεύοντος τὴν τῶν φυσικῶν πραγμάτων δομὴν, γενικῶς δ' αὐτῆς ἐνεργουμένης κατὰ τὰ ὥς ἄνω quanta, καὶ αὐτὰ ὑποκείμενα τοῖς περὶ τὴν διαστολὴν τοῦ σύμπαντος νόμοις!

Ἡ πηγὴ τῶν φυσικῶν νόμων.

Καὶ τὰ ὥς ἄνω μὲν ὡς πρὸς αὐτοὺς τοὺς φυσικοὺς νόμους. 'Αλλ' ὅτι δὲ εἰς μόνος ἄνθρωπος κατῳρθώσεν ἀνακαλύψαι τόσα πολλὰ καὶ τόσον πλήρως εἰς ἓν σύστημα νόμων διαπλεκόμενα ἐστὶ καθ' αὐτὸ γεγονὸς πρώτης καὶ πραγματικῆς σημασίας! Εἴτε πρόκειται περὶ τινος ὑπερεπιστήμονος, εἴτε τι ἄλλο συμβαίνει! 'Αποποιούμαι τὸν χαρακτηρισμόν! 'Ἐχω αὐτογνωσίαν! 'Ἄλλο τι ὄντως συμβαίνει! 'Ἄλλος ἐστὶν ὁ Νομοθέτης!· Ὁ κόσμος, ἢ ὁ Θεός! Εἰς τὴν πρώτην περίπτωσιν, διότι λογικοὶ νόμοι ἐφαρμόζοντ' ἀδιακόπως καὶ ἐνιαίως, ἀπαιτεῖται κοσμικὸν τι κέντρον ἀναφορᾶς, λήψεως ἀποφάσεων καὶ ἐκδόσεως διαταγῶν καὶ ἄπειρος ταχύτης μεταδόσεως τῶν σχετικῶν περὶ ταῦτα πάντα στοιχείων δι' ὑφισταμένων δικτύων μεταδόσεως μέχρι περάτων τοῦ φυσικοῦ σύμπαντος! 'Ἀλλὰ νῦν σαφῶς ἀποδείκνυθ' ὅτι ὡς καὶ αὕτη ἡ ταχύτης τοῦ φωτὸς οὐ μόνον ἐστὶ λίαν βραδεῖα πρὸς τὸν σκοπὸν τοῦτον ὡς ἀπαιτοῦσα δισεκατομμύρια ἔτη ἵνα τὸ φῶς φθάσῃ ἕως περάτων, καὶ οὐδὲν ὑπάρχει τοιοῦτον δίκτυον μεταδόσεως, καὶ τοιοῦτον ἀποφάσεων κέντρον οὐ διαφαίνεται! Τί οὖν δεῖ ἡμᾶς ἀποφαίνεσθαι τῆς πρώτης περιπτώσεως οὕτως ἀναγκαίως ἀπορριπτομένης; Πῶς οὐχὶ ὅτι ὁ Θεός ἐστὶν ὁ Νομοθέτης καὶ ὅτι ἄλλως ἐπιβάλλει τοὺς νόμους;

Ἡ ὑποδοχὴ τῆς εἰδήσεως.

Ὑμεῖς ὡς ἄνθρωπος τῶν γραμμάτων, οἷα ἀνακαλύπτειτ' ἀληθινά, ταῦτα καὶ λέγετε εὐθαρσῶς, ἐπὶ προσωπικῇ ζημίᾳ ἀναμφιβόλως πλειστάκις. Τί

ἐποιεῖτε ἂν, εἰ τὰ ὡς ἄνω ἀνεκαλύπτατε; Ἀπὸ τοῦ 1986, τοῖς καθηγηταῖς κάρχιερεῦσιν ἀρμοδίως ἐγνωστοποίησα τὰ εὐρήματα, μηδενὶ ἐτέρῳ **one penny** στοιχίσαντα! Διὰ τὴν ἐπιστήμην οἱ μὲν, διὰ τὴν Θεοῦ ἀγάπην οἱ δέ, διὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν πάντες, παρεκλήθησαν ἅμα καὶ προεκλήθησαν εἴτε διαψεῦσαι εἴτε ὁμολογῆσαι τὰ εὐρεθέντα! Ἐπὶ τῆς οὐσίας, *πλήρης* ἦν ἡ σιγὴ αὐτῶν πάντων! Καὶ ὁμιλῶ διὰ τὰ μέγιστα τοῦ κόσμου πανεπιστήμια καὶ ὀκτὼ βραβιούχους Nobel! Οἱ πονηρότεροι (ἐν οἷς καὶ ἀρχιερεῖς) οὐδὲ λήψιν "συστημένων" γραμμάτων καὶ δεμάτων ἔσχον τὴν φιλοφρόνησιν ἀντιγνωστοποιῆσαι μοι! Ἡ "ἐπιστήμη" χῆ ἐπικρατοῦσα *δῆθεν* "χριστιανικὴ" ἐκκλησία *ἀρνοῦνται* συζητῆσαι, *ἀποσιωποῦσι* παρὰ τὴν ἀδυναμίαν τῶν ἀντικρουσ' ἐπιτυχῶς τἀποκαλυπτόμενα καὶ *ἐμποδίζουσι παντοιοτρόπως* γενήσεσθαι γνωστὰ τὰ εὐρήματα, ὡς καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἔτι τῆς *ἀρνήσεως* αὐτῶν ἐπιτρέψαι *ἀποδοχὴν καὶ ἔκθεσιν* εἰς πανεπιστημιακὰς καὶ ἄλλας βιβλιοθήκας (ὡς **The Public Library of the City of New York**) *δωρεὰν διδομένων ἀντιτύπων* τοῦ ταῦτα πάντ' ἀποδεικνύντος βιβλίου! Ἐνῶ βεβαίως, διὰ τὴν "ἐλευθερίαν τοῦ τύπου", τὰ πορικὰ ἔντυπα κυκλοφοροῦσιν, ἐκτίθενται καὶ συζητοῦντ' ἐλευθέρως *εἰς ὅλα τὰ μήκη καὶ πλάτη* τῆς δυστυχοῦς αὐτῆς γῆς!

Αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐπιστήμην, Θεὸν καὶ Ἀλήθειαν πίστις τῶν ῥαββίνων, πατέρων καὶ καθηγητῶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων! "Ἄλλα εἰσέτι θέσφατα θεωροῦσιν, ὑπ' ἀμαθῶν ἢ ἡμιμαθῶν ἐν καιροῖς σκοτεινοῖς, ἢ ἔστω σκοτεινότεροις τῶν νῦν, διατυπωθέντα, ὡς ἂν ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἐκείνων κειμένοις ἐξηγητλήθῃ πᾶσα ἡ Σοφία τοῦ Μεγάλου Θεοῦ! Τὸ τί διὰ τῆς δομῆς αὐτοῦ διηγεῖται τὸ σύμπαν οὐδόλως αὐτοὺς ἐνδιαφέρει! Δι' ὃ, τοῦτο νῦν ἐρωτῶνται: Πόθεν πάντα ταῦτα ἐστίν, ἐκ Θεοῦ ἢ ἀνθρώπου; Εἰ ἐκ Θεοῦ, διατί οὐκ ἀποδέχονται ταῦτα; Εἰ ἐξ ἀνθρώπου, διατί ἀρνοῦνται καταδεικνύναι τὰ *τότ' ἀπαραίτητα* ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῦ εὐρήμασιν ἐγκείμενα σφάλματα; Πῶς οὐδ' ἐπὶ τοῦτο φωτίζει αὐτοὺς ὁ Μέγας Θεός, ἐν Οὐ τῷ ὀνόματι δρώσιν *ὡς* δρώσιν;

Εἰλικρινῶς ὡς μηχανικὸς καὶ ἐπιστήμων *ἀδυνατῶ* κατανοῆσαι *πῶς* ἐστὶ δυνατόν ἀνθρώποις "μορφωμένοις", καθηγηταῖς πανεπιστημίου (ὧν ἡ ὅλη "γνώσις" συνίστατ' εἰς μόνην τὴν *ἀποστήθην* ἢ *ἀντιγραφὴν ἢ ξένων κειμένων ὑποκλοπῇ*), καὶ "παιδαγωγοῖς" τῆς κοινωνίας καὶ τῶν γενεῶν αἱ ἐπέρχονται, τἀρνεῖσθαι ὡς ἔτι καὶ σήμερον κατανοεῖν τὴν πραγμάτων φορὰν, καὶ ἔχειν τοιαύτας ὅλως ὁμιχλώδεις *μεσαιωνικὰς* ἀντιλήψεις περὶ Θεοῦ, ἀνθρώπου καὶ κόσμου ὥστε μὴ τολμᾶν ἐλθεῖν εἰς *σύγχρονον συζήτησιν* ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον προτιμᾶν τὰς τε εἰς αὐτοὺς *προσφιλεῖς* "συζητήσεις" κωφῶν (ὡς ἂν ἡ παροῦσα ἐποχὴ τε κἀληθῆς διανόησις οὐδὲν ἔχη προσφέρειν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀντικειμένου), καὶ τὸ βάλλειν μετὰ τόσης μανίας κατὰ τῆς ἐπιστήμης· καθ' ὃν χρόνον οὐδὲ διανοοῦνται ἐγκαταλιπεῖν τὰς *μεγάλας* ἀνέσεις, ἰδιωτικὰ ὀχήματα, τηλεοράσεις, φορητὰ τηλέφωνα κ.λ.π., θεωρούμενα πλέον "κεκτημένα τῶν δικαιώματα" ἀλλ' ἐξασφαλισθέντα ὡς κὰς αὐτοὺς καὶ πάντα ἀγράμματον ἀκριβῶς δι' αὐτῆς γε τῆς ἐπιστήμης ἦν τοσοῦτον μεγάλως πάντες οὐτοι μισοῦσιν!

Ὁμολογῶ πάντα ταῦτα οὐκ ὀλίγα ἐστί, ἀλλ' ἦν τὰ ἐλάχιστα ὅσων καθ' ὁδὸν ἤϊρον ἀναγκαῖα μνημονεύσαι! Εἰ ὑμεῖς ἔχετε σχόλιόν τι, μετὰ χαρὰς αὐτὸ δέξομαι! Ἀλλά, θερμῶς παρακαλῶ, *μὴ* σὺν αὐτοῖς χύμεις περιπέσῃτε

εἰς ταὐτὸ ἀπύθμενον φρέαρ τοῦ "λογοτεχνεῖν", "ρητορεύειν" καὶ πολλὰ λίαν λέγειν διὰ λόγων ἐλάχιστα κατανοητῶν ἐν τῷ πλήρει βάθει τῶν σημαινόμενων καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ ἔτι τοῦ χρησιμοποιούντος αὐτούς! Διψῶ διὰ λόγον οὐσιώδη, *οὐσιώδη! Βαρὺν* ὥς ἡ γῆ, ὥς αὐτὸς ὅλος ὁ Οὐρανός! Ὑπερήρκεσαν αἱ φλυαρίαι, αἱ εἰς τοῦτον τὸν βόθυνον περιττωμάτων καταρρίψασαι τοῦτον κυρίως τὸν τόπον, ὅπου ποτὲ διὰ τοῦ Λόγου διηυγάσθη ὁ Ἄνθρωπος!

Φιλικώτατα & Ἔτη Πολλά,

[N. B.: Κατὰ τὴν ἐτοιμασίαν τῆς παρούσης δημοσιεύσεως, ἡ γλῶσσα ἐβελτιώθη καὶ τινες ἐλάχισται μεταβολαὶ καὶ προσθήκαι ἐκρίθησαν ἀναγκαῖαι.]

ΑΠΟΚΡΙΣΙΣ: Οὐδεμία.

Re: ANAXΩΡΗΤΙΣΜΟΥ ΚΡΙΤΙΚΗ

Κύριον Χρήστον Γιανναρᾶν
Πλαστήρα 84—Ίωσηφόγλου 3, Νέαν Σμύρνην
Ἀθήνας, 17121

11 Ἰανουαρίου 1997.

Ἀγαπητέ Κύριε Γιανναρᾶ:

Ἀναγκάζομαι εἰς τὴν παροῦσαν ὑπὸ τῆς ὑπὸ τίτλον "Φυγὴ σὴν <<αντικειμενικότητα>>" ὑμετέρας ἐπιφυλλίδος. Διὰ τὸν ἐν κατακλείδι μνημονευόμενον λόγον, ὅστις γενήσεται καὶ πρὸ τοῦ τέλους σαφής, *μόνον μετὰ πολλοῦ κόπου* ἀπέφυγον ἀνάλογον διάβημα μέχρι τοῦδε! Νῦν, ὑμεῖς αὐτοὺς ἐξεχειλίσατε τὸ ποτήριον *ὅπερ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ τίθετε*, εἴθ' ἵνα καὶ γὰρ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ πῶς ἀδιαμαρτυρήτως, εἴθ' ἵν' ἀντιδράσω *σφοδρῶς!* Ἐν Χριστῷ (εἰ ἔτι πιστεύετε!) παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς ὅπως προσεκτικῶς ἀναγνώσητε πᾶν ὅ,τι ἀκολουθεῖ! Τὸ ὑποχρεοῦν ὑμᾶς εἰς περίσκεψιν, οὐχὶ τὸ προσβάλλειν ὑμᾶς, ἐστὶν ἡ κινουσα με πρόθεσις!

Καλῇ τῇ πίστει ὑποτίθημι ὅτι ὡς θεολόγος, φιλόσοφος, οὐδὲ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ καθηγητὴς *ἔχετε κατ' ἐλάχιστον τὴν θεωρητικὴν ἐπαγγελματικῶς απαιτουμένην συναίσθησιν* τῆς *κολοσσιαίας βαρύτητος* τοῦ δημοσίου λόγου (προφορικοῦ καὶ γραπτοῦ) τοῦ διαμορφούντος τὰς συνειδήσεις τῶν πολιτῶν! Νῦν, ἡ ὡς ἄνω ἐπιφυλλὶς ὑποχρεοῖ με συμπεραίνειν εἴθ' ὅτι *οὐκ ἔχετε καὶ τὴν ἀναγκαίαν πρακτικὴν συναίσθησιν* τῆς *ἀνάγκης ἀπολύτου συνεπειᾶς* τοῦ δημοσίου λόγου *τρέμειν* ποιοῦσαν πάντα σὺν Θεῷ συνειδητὸν ὁδηγὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, εἴθ' ὅτι τυφλωθεὶς ὑπὸ γυμνοῦ συναισθήματος *οὐκ ἀντιλαμβάνεσθε* πλέον τί ὄντως γράφετε, εἴθ' ὅτι *κατὰ ψυχρὸν ὑπολογισμόν τυφλώσεως καὶ βυζαντινοῦ μανδρώματος τοῦ δεσμίου* "ποιμνίου"-ἀναγνωστῶν διὰ τὸ γάλα καὶ τὴν σάρκα [ἄπερ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τῆς "ἐκκλησίας" διήρesan τοὺς ἀπίστους καὶ θρασυτάτους αὐτοκλήτους "ποιμένας", κατὰ καθαρωτάτην περιφρόνησιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἴδιον αὐτῶν ποίμνιον ἐπ' ἐκμεταλλεύσει δοκήσαντας τοὺς Πολίτας τοῦ Παραδείσου] ὑμεῖς καὶ οἱ σὺν ὑμῖν ποιεῖτε πᾶν ὅπερ ποιεῖτε, εἴθ' ὅτι ἀπλῶς θεωρεῖτε ἑαυτὸν εἰδήμονα κατὰ θεμάτων περὶ ὧν οὐδὲν ὡς ἐπιστήμων ὄντως γινώσκετε, *ιδίαν αὐτῶν ἔχων πολυετὴ συνειδητὴν πασῶν τῶν συνεπειῶν πείραν!* Ἀντιλαμβάνεσθε, ἔστω καὶ κατ' ἐλάχιστον, τὴν *μεγάλην* σύγχυσιν καὶ ζημίαν ἃς προκαλεῖτε;

Τοῦλάχιστον ὡς φιλόσοφος, *δέετε συμφωνεῖν* ὅτι λόγος *ἐγγενῶς ἀσαφής* τὴν παροῦσαν γενικὴν τῆς ἐλληνικῆς κοινωνίας σύγχυσιν αἶρειν οὐ δύναται, ἀλλ' ἔτι μάλλον ἐπιτείνει αὐτήν! Ὡς ἐπίσης, ὅτι ὡς ἄλλοι οἱ σκοποὶ τοῦ "φιλολογικοῦ", θεατρικοῦ, ῥητορικοῦ καὶ διδακτικοῦ λόγου, ἄλλος δὲ εἶναι καὶ ὁ *τρόπος* [περὶ οὗ πολὺν ὄντως λόγον ποιεῖτε!] ἐκάστου, ὥστε

πείθειν ἐπὶ τῷ σαφῶς δηλουμένῳ ἐπιδιωκομένῳ σκοπῷ! Ἀναγκάζετε με συναγαγεῖν ὅτι ὡς ἐκ τῆς ἰδίας ὑμῶν ἐκπαιδεύσεως εἰς τὰς ἑλληνιστὶ κακῶς καλουμένας ἀνθρωπιστικὰς "ἐπιστήμας" (humanities, αἵτινες ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀγγλοσαξόνων ὀρθῶς οὐ θεωροῦντ' ἐπιστήμαι), προσπαθεῖτε συνδύαζειν (ἀλλ' ἄνευ τινὸς ἐπιτυχίας) ὅλους τοὺς ἀνωτέρω λόγους ὡς καπὶ πραγμάτων τῆς ἀληθῶς ἀντικειμενικῆς πραγματικότητος, ἅτινα μόνον κατ' ἐπιστήμην (ἐφ' ἧς, ὡς διαφαίνεται, οὐκ ἔχετε οὐσιαστικὴν ἐκπαίδευσιν) πρέπει μελετᾶσθαι, καὶ ἐκφράζεσθαι κατὰ λόγον τοῦλάχιστον χειρουργικῶς κοπτερόν ἀποδεικτικόν, ἀκόμη καὶ ὅταν κακῶς θεωρῇται ὅτι "προσβάλλει" τοὺς κρινομένους!

Οὐδένα ἐγὼ δυστυχῶς σαφῇ κάγαθόν σκοπὸν τῆς ὅλης ὑμῶν προσπαθείας συναγαγεῖν δύναμ' ὑποδηλούμενον διὰ τῶν ὑμετέρων συμφραζομένων, ἢ ἀνακαλέσαι ὡς σαφῶς παρ' ὑμῶν ὡς θεολόγου καὶ φιλοσόφου δεδηλωμένοι! Συνεπῶς, κοῦδεμίαν ὁδὸν φυγῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ λαβυρίνθου ἐν ᾧ αὐτὴ ἡ ἑλληνικὴ κοινωνία ἐνέπλεξεν ἐαυτὴν τυφλῶς ἀγομένη ὑπὸ τῶν τυφλῶς "ὁδηγούντων" αὐτὴν δύναμαι διακρίνειν παρ' ὑμῶν προτεινομένην! Ἀλλ' ἄνευ σκοποῦ καὶ τῆς ἐπὶ κείνῳ ὁδοῦ, πάντες οἱ ἐλάσσονα τῆς ἐμῆς ἔχοντες μὀρφωσιν (ἢ δυνατότητα κατανοήσεως, ἀπὸ τοιαύτης μορφώσεως) ἀναγκαστικῶς **νεφελώ-
δη ἔως κατεσφαλμένα**, κατὰ τὸ ἴδιον αὐτῶν μόνον συναίσθημα ἢ προκατάληψιν ἢ "γνώσιν" ἐλλειπεστάτην, συνάγουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν ὑφ' ὑμῶν δηλουμένων· οὐχὶ τὰ ἃ ὑμεῖς αὐτοὺς ἀποδεικτικῶς κατὰ Λόγον ὀφείλετε παράγειν σαφέστατα συμπεράσματα! Πολλοὶ εἰσι σήμερον οἱ διὰ τῶν μέσων ἐπικοινωνίας αἰσχροί, γυμνῇ, ταπεινῇ ἀσκοῦντες πολιτικὴν "θεολόγοι" κάρχιε-
ρεῖς! Ἀλλ' οὐδὲν σωτήριον πνευμάτων, ψυχῶν ἢ τοῦ ἔθνους διακρίνεται ἐν τοῖς κειμένοις αὐτῶν! Ἀναισχύντως, οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἀπλῶς ναρκισσεύονται! Μόνον πόνον ἢ διαπίστωσησιν προκαλεῖ ὅτι *χῦμεῖς οὐδὲν κρεῖττον ποιεῖτε!* Διερωτῶμαι· μήπως *χῦμεῖς* "δόξαν" ἀμφίβολον συγχρόνου "καλλιτέχνου" ἐπιθυμῶν, μόνον ὡς ἄλλος *abstract painter purely by sentiment painting and noncommittally desiring only to please and thus increase his public appeal*, κοῦχ ὡς ζωγράφος διὰ Λόγου τὴν ζωὴν ζωγραφῶν εἰ καὶ ὀδυνηρότατα τοῖς πλείστοις θαρραλέως δηλῶν, συντίθετε λόγους καὶ κείμενα;

Ἀλλ' ἐπίσης διερωτῶμαι· ἄραγ' ἐπανέρχεσθε μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας ἢ τρεῖς εἰς τὰ παρ' ὑμῶν παραγόμενα κείμενα, ὡς ξένος κριτικῶς διελέγξει αὐτά; Π.χ., ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς ὡς ἄνω ἐπιφυλλίδος λέγετε (καὶ θρηνεῖτε διότι) "[τ]ὰ περιθώρια τῆς προσωπικῆς μαρτυρίας καὶ τῆς υποκειμενικῆς εκδοχῆς στενεύουν στον σημερινό δημόσιο λόγο ασφυκτικά"! Ἐν συνεχείᾳ, χρήσιν ποιεῖτε τοῦ ὅρου «αντικειμενικότητα» δεκαεξάκις, ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἅπαξ ὡς φιλόσοφος αἰσθάνεσθε τὴν ἀνάγκην διαχωρίζειν τὴν ἀληθῆ ἀντικειμενικότητα τῶν πραγμάτων ἀπὸ τῆς καταδυναστεύσεώς 'της ὡς «αντικειμενικότητας» καὶ ὑφ' ὑμῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῶν σὺν ὑμῖν πανεπιστημιακῶν καθηγητῶν, καὶ τῶν ὑπ' αὐτῶν πάντων "μορφωθέντων" "πολιτικῶν" καὶ λοιπῶν δημοσίων σοφιστῶν! Δὶς ποιεῖτε χρήσιν τοῦ ὅρου "πραγματικότητα" (ἐν οἷς καὶ "πραγματικῶν δεδομένων"), ἀλλ' οὐδεμίαν ταύτης παρέχετε συσχέτισιν πρὸς τὴν ἀντικειμενικότητα τῶν πραγμάτων! Ἀντιθέτως ἅπαξ ἔτι δηλοῦτε τὸν διαφαινόμενον ἀμέριστον προσωπικὸν ὑμῶν θαυμασμόν πρὸς τὴν σχετικότητα τοῦ Einstein, λέγων ὅτι "[ό]σο περισσότερο ἐμπεδώνεται ἡ ἐπίγνωση τῆς σχετικότητας στίς φυσικὲς επιστήμες, τόσο μοιάζει νὰ μειώνεται μιὰ τέτοια ἐπί-

γνώση στην οργάνωση και λειτουργία του κοινωνικού μας βίου" και "σίγουρα, αυτό που πρώτιστα ενδιαφέρει τον καθένα μας είναι να προλάβει να γευτεί όσο γίνεται περισσότερη σύμπτωση της αλήθειας με την ομορφιά, της ελευθερίας με την προσωπική δημιουργία, του έρωτα με την αμοιβαιότητα της αυτοπροσφοράς. Μπροστά στον δικό του ο καθένας μας θάνατο βλέπει το παρόν ή το μέλλον της πατρίδας του και της ανθρωπότητας με πολύ ρεαλισμό σχετικότητας"!

Ἀρχόμενος ἀπὸ τοῦτου τοῦ τελευταίου, διερωτώμαι· ἔστι πως ἔτι δυνατόν ὑμῖν ἱκανῶς πεπαιδευμένῳ ἀνθρώπῳ *ἀγνοεῖν* ὅτι·

ἢ δῆθεν "φυσικὴ" σχετικότης τοῦ Einstein ἐννοεῖ *οὐχὶ τὴν φιλοσοφικὴν ἢ χριστιανικὴν ἀδελφότητα* τῶν φυσικῶν πραγμάτων (ὅποτε αὐτομάτως τίθεται καὶ τὸ πρόβλημα τῆς αὐτῶν πάντων πατρότητος, τουτέστι παρὰ Πατρός!), ἀλλὰ τὴν ὑπὸ κείνου καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων αὐτῷ διὰ κείνης ἐπιθυμυμένην ἀντικατάστασιν τῆς Θεμελιώδους Ἀπολυτότητος (συνεπαγομένης καὶ τὴν ὡς ἄνω Πατρότητα!), ἣντινα κείνοι "ἀνύπαρκτον" ἐπιδιώκουσιν "ἀποδεῖξαι"· ἵνα οὕτως ἀνομολογήτως πολεμηθῇ δῆθεν "φυσικῶς", "ἐπιστημονικῶς" καὶ ἀποτελεσματικῶς πᾶσα πλήρης ἀναφορὰ ἐπὶ τὸν *Ἐνα, Προσωπικὸν καὶ καθαρῶς Πνευματικὸν Θεόν*, εἰς ὃν ὁ Einstein *οὐκ ἐπίστευε* κατ' *ἰδίαν ὁμολογίαν*, ἀλλ' *οὐχὶ ἐξ ἐπιστημονικῆς πεποιθήσεως*, ἀλλὰ μόνον διὰ τὴν ἀφόρητον ψυχολογικὴν πίεσιν ἣν ἠσθάνετο ὡς Ἑβραῖος ἐν Χριστιανοῖς (ὡς καὶ ὁ Spinoza, οὗ κατ' *ἰδίαν ἐπίσης ὁμολογίαν* ὑπῆρξε μαθητῆς μετὰ τρεῖς ὅλους αἰῶνας), διὰ τὴν ἀφ' ἧς ἀπαλλαγὴν ὠδήγησεν ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὴν *ἐφεύρεσιν* τῆς θεωρίας 'του; Ἐστὲ ἀληθῶς τοσοῦτον ἀδαῖς τῶν ὑπονοουμένων τῆς σχετικότητος, ἢ μήπως *πράγματι* πρὸς τὸν Spinozist-Einsteinian pantheism ἐννοεῖτ' ἐξωθεῖν τὴν πίστιν τῶν Ὀρθοδόξων, προσποιούμενος *σύναμα* τὴν δῆθεν "αὐστηράν" ἐπὶ ταῖς πατροπαραδότοις βυζαντιναῖς διδασκαλίαις προσκόλλησιν, ἐπὶ τοιαύτῃ "πατώντας ... στέρεη γεύση ζωῆς";

"με πολὺ ρεαλισμὸ σχετικότητος" ἐννοεῖται σήμερον μόνον ὁ πλήρης καὶ τέλειος καὶ μηδὲν ἐν τῷ ἐπέκεινα ὑποσχόμενος θάνατος;

ἐπὶ τῆς Einsteinian indeterminacy (τουτέστιν τῆς θρυλουμένης ὡς "λογικῶς ἐγγενοῦς" τῶν πραγμάτων ἀδυναμίας προσδιορίζειν τὸ *ἰδὸν* καὶ *ἐκεῖ*, ὡς καὶ τὸ *πρό*, *νῦν* καὶ *μετά*) βασιζόμενος, οὐδ' αὐτὸς ὁ Ὑψιστος Λογικὸς Θεὸς ἐδύνατο ἂν εἰς κόσμον δημιουργῆσαι τὴν ἄλλως (ἥτοι ἄνευ καὶ ταῦτα σαφέστατα καθορίζοντος νόμου) ὅλως ἄτακτον ὕλην· ἐφ' οὗ προβλήματος ὁ Einstein ἐβλασφήμησε λέγων ὅτι *he would be sorry for the Lord, if it were proved that He created the world otherwise than by his relativity theory!*;

οὐδ' ὑπὸ τῶν ἰδίων αὐτοῦ θεωριῶν ὀδηγούμενος ὁ Einstein ἐδύνατο ἀποφαίνεσθαι εἰ τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν μόνον καὶ ὑλικὸν σύμπαν (τουτέστιν αὐτὸς ὁ "Θεός" 'του) ἐστὶ χωρικῶς καὶ χρονικῶς ἀτελεύτητον καὶ ἄπειρον, οὕτως ἀποδεικνύς ὅτι οὐδὲν ἐδιδάχθη καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ ἔτι τοῦ μέλανος παραπετάσματος (background) τοῦ νυκτερινοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἐφ' οὗ προβάλλεται τὸ δόξαν μόνην Θεοῦ διηγούμενον φυσικὸν σύμπαν, τοῦ *αὐστηρότατα κατὰ Λόγον* τοῦτο δημιουργήσαντος; Παρακαλῶ, εἴπατε μοι: Ἄνευ Λόγου, *ποῦ ὄντως* ἐρεῖδονται οἱ φυσικοὶ νόμοι; If not on Λόγος, where do the here, there, before, now and after stand? Einstein did *not* say! Yet, no professor ever dared ask!

εἰ καὶ ὡς τῆς "Δύσεως" δημιουργήματα ἐμφανίζεθ' ἡ σχετικότης τοῦ Einstein, πάντως τῆς κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀνταρσίας ἐστὶ γνησιώτατον τέκνον, ἐν τῇ σκοτεινότητι "Ἀνατολῇ" πρῶτον ἐμφανισθείσης, ἀρξαμένης καὶ ἔτι ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑβραίων ποδηγετουμένης, καὶ ταύτης ὑπὸ τῶν ἀπανταχοῦ ἀπίστων καταστάσα σημαία, οὐδὲν τὸ κοινὸν ἔχουσα μετὰ τῆς Χριστιανικῆς Δύσεως· [ἡς ἀποδείκνυτε ἑαυτὸν καὶ ὅλως ἀγνοεῖν (being unaware of, or deliberately ignoring?) τὴν ἰσχυρότητα ἔτι κρατοῦσαν Χριστιανικὴν θεμελίωσιν καὶ οὐδεμίαν ἔχειν ἰδίαν, ἔσθωθεν, οὐσιώδη, πολυετῇ, ἐκ στενῶν προσωπικῶν σχέσεων μετὰ τῶν ἐκεῖ "κοινῶν" ἀνθρώπων, διὰ τῆς καθημερινῆς ἐπὶ τὸ ζῆν ἀγωνίας κεκτημένην πείραν, ἂν καὶ προσκαίρως ἠρέθθητ' ἐκεῖ διὰ "σπουδᾶς" ἢ "γνωριμίας" ἢ ἀπλοῦν κομπασμὸν ἐνώπιον τῶν ἐνταῦθα];

οὕτως ἀναφερόμενος εἰς τὴν σχετικότητα, ἄρ' οὐχ ὁμολογεῖτε Θεὸν ζῶντα;

τοιαῦτα λέγων οὐδεμίαν ἑαυτῷ περιποιεῖτε τιμὴν, αὐταποδεικνύμενος ὅλως ἀδαής τῶν Θεολογικῶν ὑποκειμένων καὶ τῆς ἀληθοῦς καὶ τῆς φαινομένης ἐπιστήμης, ὡς καὶ τῶν θεμελιακῶν ἐπιστημονικῶν ὑποκειμένων τῆς ἀληθοῦς Θεολογίας;

εἰς τὸ "ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν" ἐπισυνάπτειτ' ἀδιαχωρίστως τὸ ὅτι "ἐπιστημονικῶς, οὐ τυχαίως, οὐδὲ κατὰ τιν' ἐγγενῇ ἀπροσδιοριστίαν, ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς ταῦτα", ὡς ἤδη ἀπὸ τοῦ 1985 ἀποδέδεικται ἀκλονήτως, ἀλλ' ἡ παγκόσμιος συνωμοσία ἀπίστων καὶ ἀναισχύνητων καθηγητῶν καὶ "ἱεραρχῶν" ἄλλους ὑπηρετούντων σκοποὺς καὶ αὐθέντας οὐκ ἐπιτρέπει καθίστασθαι γνώσις κοινῇ;

οὕτω τὴν σχετικότητα εἰς ἐπίρρωσιν τῶν ὑφ' ὑμῶν ὑποστηριζομένων ἐπικαλούμενος, οὔτε σύγχρονον ἀποδείκνυτε ἑαυτὸν, οὔτε καὶ τὴν ὑμῖν μισητὴν "Δύσιν" πολεμεῖτε διὰ τῶν ἰδίων αὐτῆς ὀπλῶν;

Ἐρχόμενος νῦν εἰς τὴν «αντικειμενικότητα», ἔστι πως ἔτι δυνατόν ὑμῖν μὴ ἀντιλαμβάνεσθ' ὅτι πεισμονίως ἀρνούμενος ἢ καὶ σκοπίμως πρὸς ξένα τῇ αὐτῆς φύσει συγχέεσθ' ἐγκαταλείπων τὴν ἀντικειμενικότητα τῆς πραγματικότητος, ἣν οὐδὲ πῶς ἐξετάζετε ἀλλ' οὕτω μᾶλλον ἔτι συκοφαντεῖτε, οὐσίᾳ ἐπιζητεῖτε οἰκοδομεῖν, εἴ ἐστὶ ποτε δυνατόν, "στέρεη γεύση ζωῆς" "πατώντας" ἔτι καὶ σήμερον ἐντὸς "τ[ων] περιθωρί[ων] τῆς προσωπικῆς μαρτυρίας καὶ τῆς υποκειμενικῆς εκδοχῆς [που πιά] στενεύουν ασφυκτικά";

Τίνος εἶδους "στέρεον" ἔδαφος τίνος εἶδους ζωῆς δύνατ' εἶναι ἡ παρ' ἐνὸς ἐκάστου πεισματικὴ "υποκειμενικὴ εκδοχή" τῆς μιᾶς πραγματικότητος; Τί ἀληθῶς ἕτερον πράττουσιν, εἰ κἀνεπιγνώστως, ὡς καὶ οἱ παράφρονες; Νομίζετε ὅτι σώζεσθ' ἀπὸ τῆς κατηγορίας τῆς ἠθελημένης παραφροσύνης διὰ τῆς πλήρους ἐπιγνώσεως τῆς ἀποδοχῆς τῆς "υποκειμενικῆς ἐκάστου εκδοχῆς" ὡς ἀπὸ Θεοῦ "Ἀληθείας"; Πῶς ἐστὶ τοῦτο Ὁρθοδοξία; Ἐπὶ τέλους, ἀκριβῶς πόσας, μίαν ἢ πολλὰς, "ἀληθείας" ἐδημιούργησε καθ' ὑμᾶς, θεολόγον, φιλόσοφον, καθηγητὴν πανεπιστημίου ὄντα, ὁ μία καὶ μόνη Ἀλήθεια Ὡν Θεός;

Πῶς ἐστὶ τοῦτο συνταγὴ "σύμπτωση[ς] τῶν πολλῶν καὶ ... συντονισμ[οῦ] σε ἀρμονικὴ ομογνομία"; καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶ μᾶλλον συνταγὴ ἀσφαλῆς πλήρους διασπάσεως τοῦ κόσμου εἰς ὅλως ξένα πρὸς ἀλλήλ' ἄτομα, ἀντιβαίνουσας πρὸς τὴν "κοινωνικότητα", ἥς τὴν ἀπώλειαν ὡσαύτως θρηνεῖτε,

τουτέστιν ἀκριβῶς καθ' ὃν χρόνον εἰσηγείσθε μέτρον "ιάσεως" διασφαλίζον τὴν πλήρη κείνης διάσπασιν;

Πῶς ἐστὶ τοῦτο δίκαιον αἴτημα, καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶ μᾶλλον μία δημοσίως κλαυθυμρίζουσα καὶ δικαίως τὴν παγκόσμιον ἀηδίαν προκαλοῦσα ἐπαιτική ἱκεσία μὲν παροχῆς ἀδείας βιωματικῆς διαμονῆς εἰς δικαίως ἀνεπιστρεπτὶ παρελθόντας σκότους αἰῶνας πεισματικῆς ἐφ' ἑαυτοὺς καὶ πάντας ἐπιβολῆς τῆς ἠθελημένης ἀγνοίας, θρασεῖα συγχρόνως δ' ἀπαίτησις παρ' ἄλλων ἀναλήψεως τῆς βαρείας δαπάνης τῆς ταυτοχρόνου πολυτελοῦς διατηρήσεως καὶ τῷ παρόντι συγχρόνῳ καιρῷ τῶν οὕτως ὑποκειμενικῶς καὶ σχιζοφρενικῶς ἐπιθυμούντων διαβιοῦν χάριν τῆς "ἐθνικῆς" καὶ "θρησκευτικῆς" αὐτῶν "ιδιαιτερότητα(ς)· οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ ὑβρεῖς κατὰ τῶν τρεφόντων αὐτοὺς συμβαλλόντων τῇ παγκοσμίῳ προσπαθείᾳ ἐπιβιώσεως καὶ πολιτισμοῦ; [Ὑμεῖς αὐτοὺς μόλις πρὸ τινων ἐβδομάδων ὑπενευμίσατε τοῖς Εὐρωπαίοις καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἐξ ἐκείνων ὅτι οἱ πρόγονοί 'των **had just descended from the trees** ὅτε τὸ Βυζάντιον ἤδη ἐδημιούργει "Θεολογίαν"! ('Επ' εὐκαιρίᾳ, πῶς οὐ κατανοεῖτε ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς..." εἰς τὸ "Δι' εὐχῶν τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἡμῶν..." λεγομένων ἐν βαττολογούντων "Χριστιανῶν" ἐκκλησίαις, αὐτὸς ὁ ὅλος ὡς Χριστὸς ἐνανθρωπήσας Θεὸς βλασφημεῖται, διαρρήδην ἀπαγορεύσας τὸ καλεῖν καὶ καλεῖσθαι πατέρα τινὰ τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς;)] Εἰς ἧς τὴν ἐπικουρίαν καὶ "δόξαν" αἰωνίαν ὑμεῖς νῦν λέγετε πάνθ' ὅσα "χριστιανικώτατα" λέγετ' ἀνευριάστως! Πῶς ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι καὶ ἡμῶν οἱ πρόγονοι, εἰ καὶ παλαιώτερον, ἐπίσης ἀπὸ τῶν δένδρων κατήλθον; Τίνος εἵδους "συμβολὴν" εἰς τὴν παροῦσαν πολιτισμικὴν τοῦ κόσμου προσπάθειαν ἀποτελοῦσιν οἱ περὶ προγόνων παιδαριώδεις τοιοῦτοι κομπασμοὶ, ἄσμενοι καὶ τῷ σκέπτεσθαι διὰ Θεολόγους, Φιλοσόφους, καὶ Καθηγητὰς Πανεπιστημίων; Τοιαῦτα οὖν ἐστὶ τὰ παρ' ὑμῶν πρὸς πόλεμον ὑπὲρ πατρίδος καὶ πίστεως (τίνων τῇ ἀληθείᾳ) ἐπιλεγόμεν' ἀκαδημαϊκὰ ὄπλα;] Τοσοῦτον οὖν ἀπώλετο νῦν ἐν Ἑλλάδι ἡ αἰδώς;

Πῶς οὐκ ἐστὶν αὐτὰ πάντα καὶ τὸν Θεὸν προκαλοῦσα θρασύτης ἀπόλυτος; Τίνι ὑμεῖς θείῳ ἢ ἀνθρωπίνῳ δικαίῳ τοιαῦτα οὕτως ἀπαιτεῖτε ἐν ὀνόματι δῆθεν τοῦ ἔθνους; Πῶς τοιοῦτον θρασὺν λόγον κατὰ φίλων μετέρχεσθε οὐδόλως κηδόμενος τῆς αἰδοῦς καὶ ζημίας ἧς προκαλεῖτε τοῖς ἐφ' ὅλη τῇ γῇ Ἑλληνικὸν ὄνομα φέρουσιν ἀλλὰ ξένοις σὺν Θεῷ παραμένουσι πρὸς ἣν ψευδῇ "πίστιν" ὑμεῖς ἐπαγγέλλεσθε;

Δύνασθε ὑποστηρίξαι Λογικῶς ἐνώπιον τοῦ Δικαίου Θεοῦ, τοῦ καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν χρόνον ἐπὶ τὸν σκοπὸν Αὐτοῦ ρέοντα δημιουργήσαντος, τὴν τοιαύτην πείσμον' ὑμῶν ἐμμοιήν; Ὁ ἀναχωρητισμὸς εἴτ' ἐστὶ πλήρης (ἀλλὰ πῶς ἐστὶ τότε ἀληθῶς σὺν Θεῷ;) εἴτ' ἐστὶ ψευδής! Ὑμεῖς οὐσίᾳ ἐπικαλεῖσθ' ἕνα ὅλως νέου τύπου "ἀναχωρητισμόν": δι' ὁλόκληρον ἔθνος ἢ ἔθνη! Ἀκόμη καὶ κατὰ δημοκρατικὴν πλειοψηφίαν εἰ ἐλαμβάνετο ἡ ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἀπόφασις, οὐκ ἂν ἔπαινε εἶναι ἄκρως καταθλιπτικὴ τῶν συνειδήσεων τῆς μειοψηφίας, καὶ οὕτως ὅλως ξένη πρὸς τὸ Θεοῦ Πνεῦμα! Αὐτὸ ὅμως, ὀφείλετε συμφωνεῖν, οὐκ ἐστὶν εἴτε φιλοσοφία ζωῆς εἴτε τις θρησκευτικὴ Ὁρθοδοξία, ἀλλὰ νηπιωδῶς πείσμων ἄρνησις τῆς πραγματικότητος! Οὐχ ὑπάρχει Ὁρθοδοξία ἄνευ τοῦ καθ' ὅλα Λογικοῦ Ἀγίου Πνεύματος! Καὶ ὑμεῖς καὶ πάντες οἱ σὺν ὑμῖν ὀφείλετε δημοσίως, ἀποδείξαι εἴθ' ὅτι ἐν Πνεύματι Ἀγίῳ λέγετε πάνθ' ὅσα λέγετε, εἴτε παντελῶς παῦσαι λέγειν τοιαῦτα, εἴτε ἐκλείψαι

ἀπὸ τῆς δημοσίας ζωῆς! Ἄλλως καταχρῆσθ' ὀνομάτων τιμίων!

Προκαλεῖ μοι μεγίστην κατάπληξιν πὼς κὰν τῷ παρόντι καιρῷ ἀρνεῖσθε κατανοεῖν χόμολογεῖν τὰ ἐξόχως ἀπλᾶ!: Τὸ Βυζάντιον οὐ κατέπεσε βαλλόμενον ἔξωθεν, ἀλλὰ σηπόμενον ἔσωθεν! Καὶ τὸν πρῶτον ἐπὶ τοῦτο λόγον πάντοτ' ἔσχεν ἡ ἀπόλυτος κυρίαρχος τῆς τότε ζωῆς βυζαντινῆ ἐκκλησία, οὐδέν ποτε περὶ τούτου τοῦ κόσμου κατανοήσασα, ἐν ᾧ πρῶτῳ ἔταξεν ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐδῶ πολιτισμοῖς οὓς οὗτοι δημιουργοῦσι καλουμένους ἀποδείξει τὸ δόκιμον αὐτῶν εἰς τὴν ἄνω Πολιτείαν μεταστῆναι, *κάκείνης καθ' ὅλα Πολῖται ἄξιοι* καταστῆναι! Ἄλλὰ τοῦτο, καὶ οἱ βυζαντινοὶ ἐλάχιστα, εἰ πως, κατενόησαν καὶ ὑμεῖς σήμερον, τῆς ἐκείνων παραδόσεως συνεχιστῆς, οὐδόλως ἀντιλαμβάνεσθε· οὐσία εἰσηγούμενος (ὡς δεῖ με εἰκάζειν) *συνέχισιν* τοῦ φοβεροῦ κατὰ μεσαίωνα χυτὸ τὰς εὐλογίας τῆς βυζαντινῆς ἐκκλησίας διαπραχθέντος ἐγκλήματος κατὰ τοῦ πολιτισμοῦ, τάνθρωπου καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ· ὥστε δικαιοτάτην συνέπειαν εἶναι τὴν πτώσιν! Οὐδόλως ἀντιλαμβάνεσθε τὴν σημασίαν τῆς δῆθεν καὶ διὰ "θρησκευτικούς" λόγους υἱοθετηθείσης ὑπεροφίας τῶν *ὑπερφιάλων* βυζαντινῶν, *πεισματικῶς ἀρνηθέντων ἀντιληφθῆναι τὰς μεγάλας εὐθύνας* ὧν, ἀπορρεοῦσας ἐκ τῆς μὴ ἔξαντλήσεως τοῦ ποτ' εἰς ἡμᾶς προσιτοῦ τμήματος τῆς Σοφίας τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἦν *πάσαν αὐθαιρέτως καὶ βλασφήμως ἐπάγωσαν* εἰς ὅ,τι πρὸ αἰῶνων ἐλέγχθη *πάντως ὑπὸ τὸ φῶς τῆς τότε λίαν περιωρισμένης γνώσεως* περὶ τε τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ κόσμου, ἦν καὶ *ἀπώλεσαν* σὺν τῷ χρόνῳ, πάντοτ' ἐν τούτοις "ὀρθοδόξους" ἑαυτοὺς θεωροῦντες, ἐνῷ κατεσπατάλουν *μέχρις ἐν τέλει τοῦ μηδενὸς* τὴν δύναμιν καὶ πλοῦτον τοῦ ποτε κραταιοῦ Ῥωμαϊκοῦ κράτους, ἦν ἐπ' ἄλλῳ σκοπῷ ἐνεπιστεύθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεός, πάντως οὐχὶ ἐπὶ μόνη τῇ διὰ τῶν γνωστῶν "θρησκευτικῶν" μέσων ἀμερίστῳ φροντίδι περὶ τὴν διὰ βαττολογουσῶν "προσευχῶν" σωτηρίαν τῆς ἰδίας ψυχῆς (κατὰ πλήρη παράβασιν τῆς Χριστοῦ ἐντολῆς περὶ τοῦ μαθητεύειν τὰ ἔθνη, ἧς παραβάσεως νῦν παγκοσμίως τὰς δεινὰς συνεπείας γενόμεθα) ἐφ' ἧ κατεσπατάλησαν ἑνδεκα ὅλους αἰῶνας!

Σὺν ἐκείνοις νῦν καὶ ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἀντιλαμβάνεσθε τὴν σκόπιμον ἐπὶ τὴν *Συντέλειαν καὶ Κρίσιν* ροὴν τοῦ οὕτω συνεχῶς κἀδηρίτως ἐκλείποντος καὶ πιέζοντος χρόνου, αἵτινες ἀπαιτοῦσι πλήρη συνείδησιν καὶ πραγμάτων τῆς ἐναιότητος τοῦ κόσμου καὶ ἀδελφότητος τῶν ἀνθρώπων· ὑπηρετοῦμένων τὰ μάλ' ἀρτιώτερον καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἔτι τῆς ὑφ' ὑμῶν *σιωπηρῶς συκοφαντουμένης* "τυραννικῆ[ς] αυτονομία[ς] τῆς [παγκόσμιας] οικονομίας", ἡ τῆς ὑφ' ὑμῶν *σιωπηρῶς λατρευομένης* βυζαντινῆς *μικροεπαρχιωτικῆς*, οὐσία δὲ *στατικῆς ἀντιλήψεως* τοῦ κόσμου καὶ χρόνου· ἥς ἕνεκα οἱ μὲν βυζαντινοὶ *κενὴν "συντήρησιν"* [τοιαύτη ἂν ἦν] τῶν ὅλως παρεξηγημένων παλαιότητων, οὐχὶ τιν' ἐπὶ κείνων *στερρὰν κατασκευὴν* τῆς ἐπὶ τὸ ὡς ἄνω Τέλος ὁδοῦ, "ὑπῆρέτησαν"· ὑμεῖς δὲ *ἀδυνατεῖτε* εἰσηγεῖσθαι *πλήρη τινὰ συγκεκριμένην* λύσιν τοῦ πνευματικοῦ κυρίως προβλήματος εἴτε τῆς χώρας εἴτε τοῦ κόσμου, ἀναλίσκόμενος εἰς *ζημιογόνους* πατριδο-θρησκευο-καπηλικὰς δονκιχωτικὰς ἐπιθέσεις κατὰ τῶν καθ' ὑμᾶς πνευματικῶς "βδελυρῶν" δυτικῶν (*ὑπηρετούντων* πάντως εἴτε θετικῶς εἴτ' ἀρνητικῶς τὸ τάχα πλέον ἐξελισσόμενον Σχέδιον τοῦ Θεοῦ) καὶ *πίεσιμονα προσπάθειαν* *πεδιήσεως* τῆς κατὰ κείμενον τὸ Σχέδιον προόδου τοῦ κόσμου· χάριν δῆθεν τῆς ἐν τελικῇ ἀφασίᾳ ἤδη εὐρισκομένης "ἐλληνοχριστιανικῆς ὀρθοδοξίας", ὑπὲρ ἧς μόνον εὐ-

χολογείτε, ἂν οὐ καὶ προσεύχεσθε πῶς καὶ *πάλιν* ταύτην ὑπὸ τοὺς Τούρκους περιελεύσεσθαι· ὥς τινες "Ὁρθόδοξοι" ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ *νῦν* *κεκαλυμμένως* *πλήν θρασύτατα* εἰσηγοῦνται, *ἀλλὰ μόνον ἵνα δι' ἑαυτοὺς τὴν ὑπ' αὐτοὺς "ποιμνίου" ἐκμετάλλουσιν* διασώσωσιν, ὅλως ἀδιαφοροῦντες περὶ τῆς τύχης τοῦ σύμπαντος κόσμου· ἦν τοῖς Ὁρθοδόξοις πρωτίστως παρέδωκεν ὁ Χριστός, ἵνα περὶ ταύτης φροντίζωσιν ὥς πολῖται τοῦ κόσμου ἐλεύθεροι καὶ πλήρως ὑπεύθυνοι ἄλλους ἐλευθέρους καὶ πλήρως ὑπευθύνους πολίτας ἀναστρέφόμενοι, οὐχί γε ὥς δοῦλοι τῶν Τούρκων! Διὰ τῆς ἠθελημένης [ᾧ τοῦ ὀνειδούς τῶν Χριστοκαπήλων!] διὰ τῆς δουλείας φυγῆς ἀπὸ τῆς διὰ τὴν εὐθύνην ταύτην ἐλευθερίας, οἱ τότε καὶ νῦν ἄκρως ἀνόητοι δοκοῦσιν ὅτι "ἀσφαλῶς διαφεύγουσιν" ἀπὸ τῆς μεγάλης πρὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ δι' ἐλευθερίας εὐθύνης ἔτων περὶ τοῦ πῶς ἀρτιώτερον, ὁμοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἀδελφῶν Χριστιανῶν [καθ' ὧν παρ' "ἐλληνορθοδόξων" ἔτι νῦν σατανικώτερον "καλλιεργεῖται" τ' ἄσβεστον μῖσος!], ἐτοιμάσουσι τὴν νῦν τάχα ἐπερχομένην τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμέραν!

Λυποῦμαι πέραν περιγραφῆς ὅτι τόσοι δριμεῖα ὠφείλον καταστήσασαι τὴν κριτικὴν ταύτην, *μυριάκις* *δυσανεστωτέραν* ἐμοὶ ἢ ὑμῖν οὖσαν, ὥστε καταδείξω τὴν *μεγάλην* *ζημίαν* ἣν ὄντως προκαλεῖ ὁ κυρίως σκοτεινός, ἄκριτος, συναισθηματικός, οὐχὶ *Λογικὸς* *κάνομολόγητ'* *ἐπιχειρῶν* *ἀσφαλῆς* *τῶν τελικῶν προθέσεων* (ἀδοκῆτως ἢ *πονηρῶς* *κρυπτομένῳ*) "λόγος"· ὁ ἀφίλους, ἀναδέλφους, *μισαλλοδόξους*, *πάσης ποιότητος* *μισητάς*, ἀπὸ πάσης ἐπὶ τ' ἄριστα *μόνα* *προσπαθείας* *ἀναχωρητάς*, τῶν ἀρίστων ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ἀρνητάς, τῆς ἀληθείας ἐπιμελῶς ἀπ' αὐτῶν *κρυπτομένης* *ἀδαείας*, καὶ τῆς σκιᾶς ἔτι αὐτῶν πρὸ αὐτῶν πάντοτ' οὔσης *περιδεεῖς* *ποιήσας* τοὺς "Ἕλληνας"! Ὑπὸ τὴν "σοφίαν" γε πάντοτε διδασκαλίαν, παρότρυνσιν, ἐποπτεῖαν, ἐπιβράβευσιν, *πλὴν ἐπὶ κρημινόν* *"ἡγεσίαν"* τῶν "πνευματικῶν" ἔτων ἀνθρώπων· καὶ *πάλιν ἐπιβούλως* (*εἰδάλλως* *μόνον* *ἡλιθίως*) *προσαγόντων* τὸ ἔθνος ἐπὶ *μάλιστα* *μείζονα* *τῆς πρώτης* *καταστροφῆν*, ἐξ αἰτίας μόνης τῆς *πλήρους* *πνευματικῆς* *αὐτῶν ἀφασίας* πρὸ τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὅλως θλιβεροῖς τούτοις τελευταίοις, *ἀλλὰ καὶ μόνοις* *ἀξίοις* *βιοθῆναι* *καιροῖς* *τεκταινομένων*! Ἀφ' ὧν οἱ ἐν Ἑλλάδι "πνευματικοὶ" ἄνθρωποι ὡς *στρουθοκάμηλοι* τὸ βλέμμα αὐτῶν αἵρουσιν, ἀλλὰ καθ' ὧν ἀπαιτεῖται ἀγὼν σκληρὸς καὶ παρ' ἐπ' ἐργασία ἐν ἔργοις *πολιτισμοῦ* *ἐσκληρυνμένων* *χειρῶν*, δι' ὧν *συγχρόνως* *δαμάζεται* καὶ *μορφοῦται* καὶ τὸ *μαλακόν* καὶ *ἄμορφον* "πνεῦμα", οὐχὶ *πλείων* *ὀμφαλοσκόπησις* παρ' ἀνθρώπων *αἰωνίως* *ἀπαλὰς* *διατηρησάντων* τὰς αὐτῶν *χεῖρας*· *κάπο* *τοῦ Θεοῦ*, *μόνου* καὶ ὅλως *ἀβοηθήτου* ὑπ' αὐτῶν δι' *ὀκνηρίαν* *ἐγκαταλειφθέντος*, *βλασφήμους* *διὰ* *κενῶν* *προσευχῶν* καὶ *νηστειῶν* *μόνων* *ἀναμενόντων* τὴν *σωτηρίαν*!

Ἄν τι τῶν παρόντων μείζονος ἐξηγήσεως χρήζῃ, παρακαλῶ, μὴ διστάσῃ!

Μετὰ λύπης μεγίστης καὶ *συμπαθείας*
(εἰ ἔτι μετὰ ταῦτα πάντα δύνασθε τοῦτο πιστεῦειν!),

ΑΠΟΚΡΙΣΙΣ: Οὐδεμία.

Re: LETTER TO MRS KITTY FERGUSON

Mrs. Kitty Ferguson
c/o Executive Director
BANTAM BOOKS,
61-63 Uxbridge Rd.
Ealing, London, W5 5SA

March 10, 1997.

On Science and Faith by way of Truth

Comments apropos of
The Fire in the Equations

Dear Mrs. Ferguson:

You deserve one's warmest congratulations for offering the world your book *The Fire in the Equations*. I discovered it only a couple of weeks ago, side by side with David Lindley's *The End of Physics*. After reading them both, I found them to complement each other *exactly as was most needed!*¹: His is the first book that I at least have seen dealing squarely and honestly with the *insurmountable predicament of reaching the practical limit* of human experimentation in fundamental physical research with such tools as, e.g., the superconducting supercollider [the funding of which, if I am well-informed, has now been canceled due to its exorbitant cost in face of the *certainty* that, *whatever could* have been discovered with it *would not be all* that still lies unknown regarding the sub-nuclear world] *before reaching any* satisfactory resolution of *all* the great issues still standing unresolved! Yours is the first book, that I at least have seen, tackling *at last* as thoroughly as you undertake, the long-standing problem of science vs. faith in God, *by far the greatest of all problems standing before us!* Your courage and thoroughness were truly remarkable, but, if you kindly allow me the re-

¹ As I will be using rather a lot of emphasis that some find tiring, permit me here to say that I use it for three purposes: to indicate what as the author I find worth emphasizing (entirely valueless if not supported by the other two); what in the interest of better comprehension I want you to stop for a moment, think about and retain for future remembrance in the entire context of this communication; and what is in the nature of the subject matter itself, that anyone would commit a mistake to miss even for a moment given its intrinsic importance. As even trying to draw the proper distinction every time would be much too difficult for both me and you, I here request your indulgence.

mark, *not all that could have been!* I fear that, in your effort not to step on any toes, you were *much too tactful!* But this is the issue *par excellence* in dealing with which *thoroughness and tact cannot both be served without any damage to either*, if the pursuit of Truth remains our goal; as surely you agree! As something *must*, it is much preferable that some of the latter rather than of the former be sacrificed! But as tact *stands apart* from true politeness, we need *not* fear!

Reading the two books together brings into sharp focus this immediate problem: In view of the above limit in the practice of science, *if all* that can be said of the problem of science vs. faith in God truly stands as you have presented in your book and nothing more can be said of it, we *seem* to have reached *the terminal irresolution* of both the still outstanding issues of science *and* this greatest of all problems! *If* it were true, this *would* be terrible! You well understand how *deeply* depressing the *combined* impact of the messages of these two books *must* be, once they sink in, on all those who *had* relied on science to provide *proofs and the final answers* about the universe and about God! But irresolution is *not* unavoidable! *Remarkable proofs and some final answers can be given!* *If*, that is, while retaining *all* our politeness, we *insist* on handling the problem with *completeness*, yielding on tact only as necessary! This I will show below! I promise to try and be as brief and succinct as I possibly will find in my power to do so! I hope I will *not* sacrifice on substance!

OUR PRESENT IMPASSE AND PERIL

Complement each other exactly as was most needed? Were this impasse and the depressing combined impact of these two books needed? Terrible to think and admit! Until you realize that, having reached them, our choosing to explore SO THOROUGHLY this dead end to its bitterest bottom by means of our beloved science was *not* after all such a *complete* waste, as it *still* allows us, now with *complete* confidence, to declare that *this* our science was *not* the way to come to the answers we had been seeking!

But only with one foot does this declaration stand on this very impasse! With the other, it stands on our *proper* unshakable basic belief that, *despite* the impasse, *Reality is rational and, thus, truly admits of a definitive answer* to those ultimate questions!

With faith in *that* alone may we declare the impasse *only phenomenal, yet, necessary* for demonstrating itself to have been the *inevitable* result *only of the tortuous way* in which we so far have walked on the road *we* marked out for ourselves to walk on, *not of the terrain itself* on which we *inevitably have had* both to mark out the *right road and walk upon it!*

Without faith in that, we may without fear just as well jump off the cliff—*with our best and brightest atheist and agnostic scientists, none other, leading the mad dance down the bottomless abyss!:* Because, whether ever expanding or

recurring, *if* the universe is irrational, it *is* meaningless; and we, having been the *chance products* of irrationality that *despite appearances could* with *far greater* likelihood *not* have brought us here than have brought us here, may follow the way of the *more likely* statistics, for all our “good” luck of appearing into being out of nowhere at all, uncalled for and unsought after! And, in the process, at least show ourselves honest and honorable believers in the correctness of our scientific thinking, not just the opposite! If we, new Jacobs, are prepared and willing to “put God to the wall” as you so aptly put it, *we must also be ready to show ourselves capable of that too!* The arguments cut *both* ways! Rather than safely watching somebody else’s (whose?) struggle who/that does not concern us from the bleachers, or gamely engaging ourselves in a pointless and indeed sick pseudo-struggle in the mud; *in truth, the live-or-die struggle is on the narrow ledge above the abyss!* I concur: God *loves* cliff-hangers, this ultimate one in particular, that proves one’s true metal! As we do *not* show ourselves ready to jump off the cliff, we *cannot* shake off the accusation that *we knowingly rely on God’s secure loving embrace up there on the ledge* to keep on abusing Him, principally with our science! We *must* drop the atheist/agnostic mask behind which we delude only ourselves; which our “best and brightest” do best than all the rest!: There is *no honesty or honor* here! Even the *devil* himself relies on God’s loving embrace to keep on fighting Him! When at last will we realize that, just as the devil is neither atheist nor agnostic but a dishonorable conscientious anti-Theist so are we? This is *only part* of the *all-out thoroughness and courage* that I had in mind above when I remarked that your tact limited your discussion! Remarks such as “but this *is* brutal, uncivil, unpolitic, *improper* in well-behaved society” *no longer* have a place: We *are up there*, on *that* all too precarious ledge fighting God, beckoning to and challenging the abyss! But I agree with you and all those others saying we are still unprepared to face the Truth! In fact, I *am* surprised that they let you publish the book! Was it because you caught them asleep, or because they judged your discussion safely noncommittal and the object of their labors at casting doubts and aspersions about God quite secure, or because after such long slumber they finally realized that events *are now overtaking them fast* and they *must* broach the subject?

That we still do *not* with them in the lead just jump off, we may *no longer* excuse it on our continuing curiosity! *If* the above impasse is true, it *shows* the *end* of our curiosity! *Nothing worthwhile* is any longer to be learned—principally from them! Our curiosity *is* without meaning and *without* value! That we still *refuse* to jump off only shows *not* just how strongly we are held back by our fear, but *how strongly we still adhere to Rationality and Meaningfulness*, that *stand intact* way beyond our desperate “scientific” fulminations!

THE SUSPICIOUS ORIGIN, GROUND AND PURPOSE OF OUR PRESENT THEORIES

Now, an implacable rationalist cynic may well wonder *whether unconsciously, unconscionably, yet truly some have attempted and still try to bring us to the brink, by designing the adopted scientific theories such as to bring us nowhere else but just there*, whether by the one or the other means! Please consider: (a) The theory of evolution both as originally conceived and as developed to date *denies all rationality* acting under what *it insists has been a totally fortuitous and undesigned “scheme”* of selection! Unquestionably, *it* was the first of the modern scientific theories that held high the banner of rebellion against all underlying rationality! *It* was behind which there *later* gathered all the “hard” sciences led by atheists and “agnostics”! It was *easily more than sixty years* after *its* appearance that physics under its own banners of relativity and quantum mechanics could at all with any semblance of “good” conscience arrive at the “conclusion” of meaninglessness! *It* first showed the way to that “conclusion”, now openly proclaimed by “all authorities and all serious scientists”! But even as the theory *still restricts itself* to biology, *no one* can deny the underlying physics on which it operates and by which it *is* inexorably carried to wherever the underlying physics leads! Why, then, do “all authorities and all serious scientists” *not* regard themselves *duty and honor bound* to spread it out to make it a *general theory of all “hard” sciences, all the way back to the Big Bang*? Surely, an implacable rationalist cynic *will* say that *there must be some reason even for that*! (b) The theory of relativity attempts to make the point, as much as Einstein could make the point stick, that, above all, underneath all, controlling all, there is a *deterministic relativity* (that is, a “*well-behaved*” *purely physical* scheme that determines *Relativity*, the new Goddess, *not Absoluteness*, the old God, as the *Controlling Principle* of the world), *not a relativistic determinism* (that is, a *firm, well-behaved* physical scheme by which *all relations* in the universe *determinately establish an unquestionable physical absoluteness* leaving the way *wide-open* to conceive *at least the possibility* of a Designer-Intelligence beyond it all! *Einstein definitely wanted this way foreclosed*!) Without the explanations in these parentheses, the difference between *deterministic* relativity and *relativistic* determinism *appears* subtle; with those explanations, the difference *is* shown to be *fundamental*! Without the explanations in the parentheses, the outcome of theorizing *appears* to have a “sensitive dependence on initial conditions”; with those differences, that outcome clearly distinguishes *worlds apart right from the start*!: True: Einstein *insisted* on a “rational absolutism”; but *only* if it operated in such a way as to make *Relativity* Goddess Maxima! To *that* “Goddess” did he *knowingly sacrifice even the possibility* of determining definitively even such *fundamental* distinctions as those of here/there and before/after, that *are essential* to *any* Goddess Maxima honoring her own name! Because it

was *only* for *Relativity* that he insisted that there is *nothing other* than the physical universe understood in *his* way, that *essentially undercut this his only "God"*, by knowingly denying "*him*" *all possibility of spatial and temporal self-knowledge!* What this makes even of the existence of "absolute rationality" having *such all too dubious* ontology as *so compromisedly* conceived by him is now obvious! (c) *Equally obvious is the fact* that, even as Einstein *thus played with fire* drawing the above not at all "subtle" distinction but *not* eliminating the idea of the Absolute though reserved for his *Relativity*, under the banner of the theory of quantum mechanics, his scientific opponents have wanted to remove *all* mention of the Absolute! *Curiously essential* to the edifice Einstein built *was indeed the door of the Absolute!* But Einstein *designed that door both as a terminal shrine to his Relativity and forever closed to the all-out uncompromising Rational Absolutism of Intelligence!* *Even more curiously*, his opponents, too, *have wanted this door both kept and walled in!* They *do want to have full access to it and use it for their purposes*, but they also want *all "illicit" connotations coming with it left unmentioned!* Thus must we see their insistence on the superiority of quantum mechanics, to which they adhere with *an even greater, and worse than medieval, religious fervor and awe; refusing, as no believer ever refused to question his God*, to question its all too obvious irrationality! But now, with the "philosophies" and intentions of these three great scientific theories exposed to full view, *what indeed is our cynic to make of all this openly concerted "scientific" effort?* That our "best and brightest" *do not* know what they are doing; thus insulting their intelligence? Or that they know full well what they are doing, having an *all too clear* objective in mind; thus doing all due honor to their intelligence, but exposing their now *all too naked* motive? Which is none other than that, as you put it, "[b]y offering a plausible competing explanation, they make unbelief a reasonable alternative" to belief?

You have made a full study of the sayings of Hawking, whom you obviously admire and respect for his courage "in the face of overwhelming adversity". And you move us to an equal respect and admiration of him, whom you call "an avowed agnostic". But even as you state that "[t]o say that Hawking or any other theorist has shown us there is no God is premature to say the least", one who does not understand the complexity of scientific theory or *how premature* that conclusion is will in the face of the continuing success of science in general tend to forget your caveats and take the man wholesale, "agnosticism" and all! Then again, when we dare "put God to the wall", why shouldn't our cynic question how Hawking *from his wheelchair* dares ask "what place for a Creator?" After all, even a "complete" *man-invented* "Theory of Everything" *cannot* be more than an *exercise on paper!* Is it possible that Hawking is ignorant of the *tremendous effort* it takes to translate our scribblings into reality, that it took *our entire civilization to date* to put a man on the Moon? Will his "Theory of Everything" *also ex-*

plain how *his* scribblings, but “written” on *no paper at all*, made this *real* universe? As his effort is to avoid the initial singularity, for his proposed theory to be correct, *it must prove the impossibility of any law* already discovered or to be discovered in the future explicitly expressing universal physical operations in terms of a *definite age* of the universe, which *automatically introduces* the notion of *Beginning*, that hides *so clumsily* behind the term “singularity”, *adopted only in order to confuse the uninitiated* (since obviously you *cannot ever* have more than *one* singularity or black hole, leaking or not, if the two terms are to remain synonymous)! Our incorrigible cynic will insist: *if* he is such a good theorist and “avowed agnostic”, rather than remaining an *advocate*, why doesn’t he, first, *also* theorize on and examine the *alternative possibility* that “the fire in the equations” is none other than the *creative* power of God through which He called into being what *He had earlier designed*, and, second, compare the two alternatives and present to us the results of *that* comparison? Now *that* would be something before which *any* cynic *would take a pause!*

Alas, our “best and brightest” *cannot* escape our cynic’s grip! You obviously concur with Hoyle whom you quote saying that “I have always thought it curious that, while most scientists claim to eschew religion, it actually dominates their thoughts more than it does the clergy”! Our cynic will reply: “But this is *not* curious! There is an *obvious* reason for that: *Both* camps deal with the problem of Reality. But they *arbitrarily* cut it down the middle, into an emotional and a logical part. The clergy take *only* the former, the scientists *only* the latter. The clergy regard God as an *unfathomable* Person, but *not also* as the *Supreme Logician, Scientist and Engineer* whose the world *is* a product; by studying which we *can* arrive at understanding *more than just that* aspect of the nature of God that *is thus* accessible to us! The scientists, *correctly*, regard the clergy’s *half* God a figment of the human imagination, but *wrongly*, *reject even the possibility* of God being *the Supreme Person!* The clergy, *wrongly*, *remain unconcerned* of the world as a *logical* product of God, *thus related* to the world of the Spirit; *they, wrongly, abandon its fate entirely in the hands of God;* nevertheless they *believe and do not contest* God! Emotionally exhausted, they *can* sleep! The scientists, trying to understand the world, are *constantly* faced with the dilemma (a) either to accept *it itself as God;* in which case, as they examine it *functioning*, they act as *anatomists of the living physical God, who however does not as he should respond* to their proddings; or (b), for being *also* most puzzled by the *obvious absence of a physical source of the logical structure* of the world, to *admit as a result* the religious view of the world as a product of an *otherworldly* God’s creative action, *which they hate doing!* *Not* that they have determined that structure and there only remains to discover its source; but that *even before discovering it, they are persuaded of its logicity, that alone justifies their own scientific labors, that would be pointless if the structure of the world were not*

logical! At rock bottom, for all their false sayings to the contrary, the scientists do very much believe in God as the Supreme Logician, Scientist and Engineer, while they refuse to accept Him as the Spiritual Person! Their only logical option in face of the unresponsiveness of the world under their anatomical prodgings, His palpable Presence in all they do, that is what they contest, are wholly taken up by, and are desperately trying to “show” nonexistent! Driven by hate, a raw emotion, they must fake logic as their reason! With so much in their minds, of course they cannot sleep!”. Here are three examples of how they try:

First: Since we first learned of imaginary numbers, we also learned they are *inseparably* associated with negative numbers, which in turn owe their existence to *our arbitrary* setting of the zero at *some definite* point of our choosing, *without* showing nonexistent the space to the left of said point. *All* negative numbers and *all* negative physical quantities owe their “presence” in our science to *some such convention; they are not real!* Hawking uses imaginary numbers (i.e., *second-class unreal* “things” hanging on the *convention* of *first-class unreal*, negative, “things”) in order, first, to “circumvent” the singularity *not just of a conventional mathematical but of the physical zero*, and, second, the *inexorable logical necessity of having a Logical Creator that alone can bring into being* physical reality out of the *physical nonexistence* the physical zero represents! Our cynic *will insist* that this second one has been Hawking’s *real* objective all along!

Second: In the section titled “The Relation of the Four-coordinates to Measurement in Space and Time” of his seminal 1916 paper, Einstein saw fit to state that “It is not my purpose in this discussion to represent the general theory of relativity as a system that is as simple and logical as possible, and with the minimum number of axioms; but my main object is to develop this theory in such a way that the reader will feel that the path we have entered upon is psychologically the natural one, and that the underlying assumptions will seem to have the highest possible degree of security”. Our cynic may justifiably read this statement thus: “It is *not* my purpose in this discussion to represent the general theory of relativity as a system that *is* as simple and logical as possible, and with the *minimum* number of axioms; but my *main* object *is to develop* this theory *in such a way* that the reader *will feel* that the path *we* have entered upon is *psychologically* the ‘natural’ one, and that the underlying assumptions *will seem* to have the ‘highest possible’ degree of security”! Are we to deny this reading and its implications? To *this* day, we have *no* proof that the theory *really is as simple and logical as possible!* Einstein *admitted* that it was *not* his purpose to *represent, let alone prove*, that his theory *really is* such! We only know that *no other theory has been permitted* to surface! The theory *is* admitted to *have been developed* in *such a way* that the reader (*which* reader? The reader *willing to believe* this theory? To *this* day, *not every* reader!) *will feel, not be shown to his satisfaction!* What? That the theory is *psychologically* the “natural” one! Now, this definitely

was *the first instance in the world annals* that a fundamental physical theory claimed validity *not on solid scientific argument but on psychological feeling of what is physical-natural!* Finally *we were* told, the assumptions underlying the theory *will seem, not be proven*, to have the “highest possible” degree of security! Our persistent cynic will ask: Would a theory as fundamentally challenging now-established dogma as general relativity was back then be allowed today to appear in the scientific press, if it made *such* representations? Would you say that the theory has since been verified; post hoc ergo propter hoc? Lindley states (on p.87) that “[t]he true accuracy of Eddington’s test *has been debated* by historians ... Since then other tests of general relativity have been devised and performed; nevertheless, because directly measurable effects within the confines of the Solar System are so tiny, general relativity *remains* a theory whose wide acceptance owes *at least as much* to its overwhelming conceptual power as to any empirical support. The theory, *fully grasped*, strikes most students of physics as something that *has to be right* because it *seems* so right” [all emphases added]! Lindley proceeds (on p. 88-90) to discuss what must be the very best “evidence” today in favor of general relativity: the Hulse-Taylor pulsar. After admitting the long-standing failure to discover gravitational waves, even in the case of this binary, he states that the observed gradual decay of the orbit of the binary “was enough to persuade most physicists that the strange distortions of spacetime, so fiercely debated ..., so contrary to the common sense ..., were real physical phenomena”. But this is *pure post hoc ergo propter hoc* reasoning, based moreover on a *substantial number of ad hoc assumptions*, Lindley was much too loyal to mention, *superadded* to those used to build relativity! In addition, the “proof” *makes no allowance for and Lindley mentions none of such unobservable phenomena certain to exist in such a close binary, as are tremendous tides and possible transfer of mater, that drain gravitational energy, but remain impossible even to calculate except on a large number of entirely dubious assumptions!* Our cynic *cannot* be persuaded that the theory of relativity has at all been proven, especially as Lindley himself admits that “[o]f all the great theoretical constructions of physics, general relativity is the least demonstrated”! This brings us back to the beginning: *What* were the *real* psychological reasons that pushed Einstein to devise his theory, that even after 92 (or 81, if you will) years of the most strenuous scientific effort the world has ever seen remains *unproven*? Looking back over his own life, *every* genius *will admit the fact* that at the ages of 26 and 37 (respectively, Einstein’s in 1905 and 1916) he had *no substantial body of personal experience* and wisdom in the ways of science or the world permitting him to speak with *authority* on its fate! What Einstein did have in abundance were his *self-confessed rebelliousness against authority*, forcing him to deny even the personhood of the God of Israel, *and certainly, the wounds he carried as a Jew in the Christian milieu*, that made him desire greatly a *scientific* scheme that would permit him both to deny reference

to ultimate absolute authority *and* to claim the correctness of *all* points of view! Without doubt, *that* was the psychological *force majeure* behind his lifelong scientific efforts!

Third: In the section labeled “Newton’s Theory as a First Approximation” of Einstein’s 1916 paper, *exist at least five unevaluated assumptions without which the title point could not be “shown” superadded* to those made before! But if *any one* assumption be given an equal probability of being right as of being wrong, for five of them to be *all* right, the probability is 1 in 32, or just over 3%! *Neither Einstein nor anybody else* has offered *any, let alone solid*, arguments that *even only those five* assumptions *indeed have very high* probabilities! On “average”, *each of them must be right by at least 87%* in order that they *all together* just have a 50% chance of being right! The *great significance even of the number* of assumptions used in building scientific theories has *not* concerned the scientists! With such surfeit of geniuses around, can it be that they *all* have failed to notice the significance of these statistics? Or are they *so* confident that nobody will notice it and call their bluff, that it is upon *such poor chances* that they play their game of world poker—with *God, none* other? [May I suggest that your mathematical physicist brother take up as an avocation the project of identification, enumeration and evaluation of *all* underlying assumptions of *each* of our presently revered scientific theories? I am certain that the scientific world *will* be astounded!]

THE BONE OF CONTENTION BETWEEN RELIGION AND SCIENCE

At this point, our now familiar cynic will interject that there has really been a *very great deal of willfulness and wishful thinking* in the making of our most revered scientific theories! And we *cannot* ignore the thrust of his remark, even if spitefully made! Mrs. Ferguson, have you said somewhere in your book (more or less in these exact words) that, “the scientists would not object to accepting God, if he were not a person”, or has this been a *very strong* impression of mine? I failed to make an immediate note of it; and later, I could not discover it! I consider this idea crucial for the arguments that must now be made. Let me start with your quotation of Joseph Ford saying that, “[m]ore than most [scientists] are content to live with unanswered questions”. I do *not* think you or anyone will deny that *far more* important than deciding whether there is *some* “God” is whether there *is the Personal* God! After all, when people ask the question, it is a *personal* God they have in mind! As you close your book with “Religion is far more optimistic than science that in some manner beyond our present concept of human reason, we can know ‘everything important’”. Perhaps the most significant difference between science and religion is that science thinks that on this quest we are entirely on our own. Religion tells us that although we who seek the truth may ride imaginary horses, Truth also seeks *us*”, allow me to say that the *single most important* difference between

those two our mistresses *is* exactly the question of the *Personhood* of God! Any religion that dismisses or yields this point to the modern wolves is an *inferior* religion, *not* worth its salt! Because, “truth” is *not* Truth unless it answers, *affirmatively, as shall be shown here*, this question, too! And science is *not* Science, if it thinks that we are on our own in the quest of the ‘important’ but are not on our own in the quest of Science! With regard to *either*, we are *equally* on our own, no more alone and no more “together”! With regard to *both*, we are who we are, *whole and undivided*! Since at the very end you capitalize Truth, let me state that when, in 1964 (then aged 30 and a graduate student at Imperial College, London) at a time of intense concentration and agony I first realized the sheer magnitude of *all-including* Truth I, too, was seeking, its *total* penetrating power, its scope over *everything seen and unseen*, I felt my hair stand on end as I then *sensed* the *Close Warm Personal Severe Loving Peace-giving Joy-radiating Safety-producing He-Presence* talking to me *both from inside me and outside me* from a distance of about two-to-three meters *from beyond the wall yet inside the room*, asking me whether I *truly meant* it that I desired to know Truth!: *Truth and God is a He*! Since then, I have found the doubts beginning to drop out of my statements on matters of science and religion, and acquired the sense of *total* conviction given *only* by Absolute Logic! No! I am *not* saying that *all* I say is Absolute Logic! What I *am* saying is that where I am wrong, I am wrong *only because I have yet to unite still more perfectly the unity of Logic* (of which Science is but a part) *and Faith in God* (for which ordinary religion is but a *poor* substitute)! If faithlessness is on the left and Faith on the right of what I say, then *the way to Truth is on the right, not the left*! It is in *this* spirit that I can say that whoever has *not* sought Truth *at least as strongly as to feel and sense as I did* back then, he/she has *not* known *either* the separate *meaning* of Science and Religion, *nor* their *indivisible* unity, and *cannot* speak with *any authority from personal conviction*! It is with such conviction that I state that *both our Religions and our Science have been much the poorer for our failure to see their intrinsic unity*!

Please, don’t misunderstand: I *don’t* blame the Bible for not being scientific enough in the way scientists would like it to be, or science for not producing in us mystical ecstasy in the way the religious people would appreciate! Each has its audience, and each its language. And the language of either, to be written down at all, must first *be* understood by those hearing it and writing it down! As religion addresses *all* people, it *must be stated in words understood by all* people! Of such a language, we may *not* expect ultimate accuracy or precision of expression, for the *sufficient* reason that *not all* people speak *such* a language! If ever comes a day when *all* people become capable of *such* a language, then indeed Truth *will* inform them of the ultimate Unity! Before that time, *all big talk* as that based on *current* theory, as I have already began showing, *is juvenile*

big talk! Again, *not all* recognition of Truth will come to us all in a flash. *We must grow, arduously,* into Truth! Both religion and science are as much personal as they are communal affairs! As a result, they require the *gradual* development of the language tools needed for their expression and dissemination. But before we produce those tools, we need an inner understanding of what it is that must be expressed. In that, not even our present science has succeeded! Because, *it has not thought through* either what it is that needs to be expressed, or even the significance of what it itself has said so far! The unity of Science and Religion *will* indeed take the *whole* of our education and of our culture! It *cannot* come without a *radical reformation*, obviously for the much, much better, of our *entire* civilization! If that is “the ultimate cultural imperialism”, so be it! God *is* indeed the Ultimate Imperialist, though with a *vast* difference! After all, isn’t the Kingdom *His*? Only anarchists may object! If our “best and brightest” object to Him for being who He is, *why* do they also object to their own rejection by the lesser ones of us? *Why* do they *not* object to their own cultural imperialism, that, as I proved above, *has* grown far, far worse than it was back in 1905 and 1916? If they feel strong enough on their own convictions, I will tell them that they have defeated *no* God, if they have *not* defeated *the* Ultimate Personal God and *His* Science! I will also tell them that they have done *no* science, if they have *not* done *His* Science! I will also tell them that, by the method of their desperately concocted convoluted theories, *no* science worth its salt can come about; only by the *only truly scientific method* that *His Personhood* requires! In the spirit taught by Plato in the *Timaeus*, I will tell them that, *only after they advance the better argument as regards Science and Faith may the wreath become theirs!* There are *many* passages in your book where the conviction *cannot* be restrained from shining through of your belief in a *Personal* God! Indeed, I will challenge anyone speaking of God to deny that when the idea of God first comes to his/her mind, he/she is *not, automatically*, thinking of God as a *He-Person*! If we *force* ourselves to speak of Him *otherwise*, *that is oppression*! No! That is *not* due to conditioning! It is due to our *automatic sense of what is the most logical*! It is *not* just mystical or cultural that *all* people speak of God in *Personal* terms! It also *is* Logical! Socrates and Plato were *not* mystics! To the degree allowed by their age, they were Logicians! Our own problem is that we since have developed a *very skewed* idea of the person! As I write to you just now, I do *not* write “for your eyes only”! *Nor* am I addressing your brain only! I am *only* addressing *your mind and your spirit*, that *is* your *person*! When you wrote that “I believe I could still be everything that I think of as essentially ‘me’ and slime along on my belly ...”, you certainly *only* had *your mind and your spirit that is your essential person* in mind! The Ultimate God *cannot* Logically be lacking even what you and we all consider your/our *essential* person! On the contrary, His position as Ultimate, *requires* that He *also* have the attribute of Person in the *ultimate* degree!

Nothing can be and thus nothing is higher than the person! I therefore feel that it must have been with considerable pain that you found yourself obliged to pay up front the bitter price of “A WORD ABOUT INCLUSIVE LANGUAGE” to Cerberus to let you publish the book!

HOW (THINKING OF) THE PERSONAL GOD SIMPLIFIES THINGS

Once we accept God as the Ultimate Living Mind Spirit Person, things get greatly simplified: First: He does *not* hide; He is *not* afraid of *anybody*! Our failure to see Him is only *ours*! We simply *do not know how to look for God*! Second: He did what He did with a *purpose* in Mind! *That* purpose is the *last* cause! *That is how* the last cause becomes *also* the *first* cause! Accepting as logically inviolable that there first be a first cause that *desires* a purpose and *wills* the means of its achievement, we *avoid the temporal and logical impossibility* of an uncaused last cause coming from the future to justify what has *already* become! Third: He did what He did with *ultimate economy* conducive to *His* purpose! In other words, *it is not obligatory that everything be arranged from the beginning, unless this is how it is most economical for the objective-purpose to be achieved! This allows for “miracles”!* Consider: No scientist creates a fully functional laboratory and locks it behind him, forever forbidding himself to intervene in the proceedings within! His next appearance in there *is not a miracle, but part of the logical course of events*! What he does *not* do as a matter of *pure* logic, he may *not* demand that God *must* do as an inviolable part of His own laws while he does *not* know either what God’s purpose is, or which is the *most economical* means of its achievement! Fourth: Considering the analogy of a painting, we *distinguish, and are not mistaken in so doing*, between the pigments spread on the canvas from the “way” (including the *manner of brush-stroke, overall technique and the overall design and scope*) in which they are spread! The same quantity of the very same pigments *can* be spread in *innumerable* ways, either by many creators or by the same one creator! What in our present case does the “way” of the creator represent? Succinctly, the *law imposed on* the pigments! We thus see *clearly* how material things are *one* thing and the laws of their operation are *another*; how the two do *not* mix but are *matched and made to cooperate* towards the perceived purpose! Why then must we assume that *God did not act similarly* and did *not* impose laws upon matter? *Where* did we find that the laws are *intrinsic* properties of matter and are *not* imposed on it? Fifth: As we *cannot* do anything unless our hand or agent *does* pass over *every* spot of our creation (think of a canvas being painted: where the hand or brush does *not* pass over, the canvas does *not* get painted there), and that spot, by the care we lavish upon it, speaks of us, so too, *every* spot of the universe God created *speaks* of His existence and presence, by the way *He made it stand as His witness*! *That* is the touchstone, by which, we *must* agree, we *can* recog-

nize Him! Unless somebody has a *yet better* way of doing so; in which case let him propose it! Sixth: Our *common* sense by which we judge things is *not wrong, only untrained in the ways of God's Logic!* Fearing nothing, *He had no reason to endow us with faulty common sense!* We could go on, but I think these *will suffice* as to how we *Logically must* think of God in the context of science. Alas, we no longer examine the *evidence* of Nature as the *witness* of God, we *only* spend our *precious* time producing *theories* and expending the *real wealth* of *others* in a *fatuous* effort to “verify” them when all along we *know* that we *cannot truly verify* them!

Let us be clear about this most important point that is usually missed: In thinking of God as just described, we do *not* create Him in our own image! While *we truly have no other or better way of thinking about God than the measure alone we naturally possess, which is ourselves*, our so thinking about Him does *not* create Him! It only establishes, *by our natural lights, the minimum requirements of perfection He must possess in order to exist*; and if somebody thinks that we here have missed something *important*, let him show it and we *will* add it! Whether He *truly* exists *still* remains to be decided by the *evidence* of Nature! *All other ways of thinking are wrong*, especially those guided by arbitrary, *elaborate* theories created ad hoc on a *multitude of unverified* assumptions! Let's repeat it: Theories *cannot* be better than what they assume! *A different or opposite opinion on this matter must be proven!* Enough all too precious time has been lost! Enough all too precious gray matter, particularly that of our “best and brightest”, has been wasted on *lost* causes!

Now, how according to the Bible are we capitally called to think of God? “In the beginning God made the heaven and the earth”. “In the beginning was the Logos”, *not just the mere “Word”!* Which of these two was then the *earlier* beginning? Were heaven and earth created first, *without* Logos? Could God be *without* Logos when He created the world? *No!* The Ultimate God *could not make anything without applying His total indivisible Being!* Was ever God *without* Logos? *No!* The *complete* Logos, namely the ability of *all three*: to *think* Logically, and to *express* Himself Logically, and to be *infused* by a Logical Spirit, is *intrinsic* to His Nature, and He *cannot* be other than what He *is by His own Nature!* These negations do *not* indicate incapacity, *nor* yielding to some extraneous superior necessity; it is an *inseparable* “part” (in *limited* human language) of the *one indivisible whole* that is God. We, therefore, go *much too far* when we, following mundane philosophy, “see” divisions in Ultimate Reality where *none such* exists! We are *much too* conscious of our human incapacity, and *much too* wrong in letting it dictate the terms *even of our understanding of ourselves*, as when we think of the products even of our own mind (*not* of our hands) as something extraneous of it! I am referring especially to Mathematical and Logical Consistency. This is *not* external, but *part* of the mind. As we grow, our mind

deepens, and in *its* depth do we find even the mathematical and logical consistency, but *more as a shadow of the real thing than the real thing itself*! This is why *we do not know fully what exactly* the famous Mathematical and Logical Consistency is! This is why *we in fact theorize about it also* when we say it must be this or that! But what is of *any our theory is of our own mind*! Out there, we may or may not find something looking *like* what is in our theory. What looks *like* does *not verify any* theory! If we truly care to find how the world *was made* (by whomever, to take the agnostic view), we *must* abandon the theories and look *hard* at the evidence/witness *after we learn to separate what is truly out there from what is only part of our theories*. Thus, what you capitalize calling it Mathematical and Logical Consistency *also is the product of a Mind out there, as it too cannot exist outside any mind at all*; and it certainly is *not* in our own mind, as we have *no* idea about what exactly it is! Once for all, we *must* understand that Mathematical and Logical Consistency *is integral, not differential*! It contains *exactly all that is and excludes all that is not*! As against that, we *only* produce *differential* theories, the real value of which, moreover, we do *not* even know, that as such *cannot* fail to “predict” *everything*; and thus *they predict nothing*! Our theories are *much too* “soft”; yet, *it is by them* that we dare test the *far harder than diamond* Reality out there! *We must swallow hard and at long last admit* that, if we find Mathematical and Logical Consistency to be a *sine qua non* of the world, what *in fact we admit as sine qua non is the Mind* within which *alone* Mathematical and Logical Consistency can at all exist! In this context, we must also admit that, if I happen to hit *perfectly* on something existing out there with my mind, that something does *not* become a thing only of my mind and cease to exist out there! This is the *other side* of what we argued just above to the effect that what is in my mind does *not* get out of it to exist out there independently of it!

However, when between what is in our mind and what is out there that is also a part of a mind we find that there is *perfect or seemingly perfect* agreement, *we must exercise good judgment*! At first sight, we *cannot* admit that perfect or seemingly perfect agreement as much more than the similarity of two *perfect or seemingly perfect* twins, who *may or may not* have the exactly same idea about something! What we see at first sight are the *envelope-ideas* of the *second* kind described just below. The *contents* of the envelopes *are separate* from their envelopes, and *it remains to be seen* whether the contents *also are* identical! This is why people declare they agree when in fact they do *not* agree at all!: They agree, or almost, on the *rough shape* of the *envelopes*, when they have *yet* to agree on what to put inside! Consider: That *one plus one equals two* is an idea that I have, that you also have. But *this fact* is the *kernel or objective ontological body of the idea* of the *first* kind contained in the corresponding *envelope-idea* forming in our minds *to contain this objective fact*. When asked

about something we answer “I have no idea”, it is usually this *second* idea we do not have in mind, and thus lack the *context* in which to associate the *kernel* of the question. When asked about something we answer that “I do not understand what you mean”, it is the *kernel-idea* of the *objective facts* that we do not understand! *Clearly*, by using either expression, we do *not* deny the existence of the objective ontological body of the kernel-idea. *Equally clearly*, we need knowledge of *both* the envelope-”idea” *and* the kernel-idea in order to process satisfactorily *all* the facts. Even as we have or have not, may or may not form, in our minds the kernel-idea of the objective fact, the latter does *not* therefore cease to be having its own ontological body, if not in our minds, then in *some other* mind, even the one “hiding” behind the objective facts of Nature! *My* (envelope-) idea and *your* (envelope-)idea *themselves* of the self-same ontological body *remain separate and intact in themselves*, as separate and intact *remain* our two minds, whether they are thinking of the same idea or of something else. But the kernel idea, even as it is housed in those envelopes, *remains nevertheless independent of them*: *Clearly, even as it is housed in “here” and is a part of our minds, it is no less a part of the reality out there!* So too, *if out there* we find what you call Mathematical and Logical Consistency, that lady *necessarily belongs first in a Mind out there*, even as by recognizing her we also make her a part of our own mind: *One ontological body thought by two, or more, minds simultaneously!* The Mind out there is *no* other than the Mind of God! We must *not* commit the *great* mistake of thinking of God *separate from all that belongs intrinsically* to His own Nature that *also includes* the Mathematical and Logical Consistency! Because we *think* of this consistency a product solely of our own scientific minds, and because this consistency has *not* been considered by traditional “theologians”, this consistency is *no* less with God! The ancient Greeks thought first of “God”, *then* of Nous or Mind, and only *then* of Logos: They found “God” to be *unworthy of their respect if he did not have a mind at least equal to their own!* Then, as they realized that having a mind does *not* protect from acting *illogically*, they recognized *logos to be the true essence of mind!* *Thus* they went back and *revised* their idea of “God”, and decided that, *only* if he had an *absolute* command *not* just of logos at their own fallible level but of Logos at the *Ultimate Infallible level*, would he be worthy of their *total* respect; in which case thus *by right*, the “he” becomes He, and the quotation marks drop from around “God”; who thus becomes the *pure Ultimate He-God!* The human mind conceived Logos to be the *highest possible* category of Being, and I need *not* spend time showing the Mathematical and Logical Consistency *to be only a part* of Logos! It is *thus* that we *cannot* conceive of a yet higher category! It is *thus* that we *only regress, and no longer progress*, the moment we deviate from this principle! It is *thus* that we *cannot* think straight about the Reality out there, unless we *first* put *all* these things in their *proper* order; in which effort we spent

the time so far, I putting down on paper all that lies above and you reading it, with interest, I trust!

CONSEQUENCES OF DISCIPLINED THINKING

And it is *thus* that, faced with the idea of the *highest possible* perfection that we associate *naturally* with God, we *cannot* but admit of *only two* possibilities: Namely, **either** that *this* God is *none* other than the *physical* universe itself, which constitutes the essence of classical philosophical materialism; in which case, *all* the highest attributes (*including* that of self-knowledge, *and* that of self-control by means of *physical* laws) that we above associated with the Ultimate God *must* be discovered to be *of, not just in*, the physical universe; **or** failing that discovery and in view of the *fact*, if it is a fact, that the universe *is here and is controlled* by laws of *other than its own devising*, that those attributes belong to an *entirely other, spiritual* (not idealistic, as opposed to the philosophical materialistic) category of being and characterize a Being having the power *not only to think* of this world, but *also to bring* it into being, *and to set it under* those laws.

And it is *thus* that we *must* undertake to examine the *objective* evidence for laws *out there* controlling the physical universe: If they are *from and of* the universe, to be considered as *proof of materialism thus having adequately been shown*; and if they are *not from, even as they control and are thus found in*, the universe, to be regarded as *the adequate proof* of God as the highest outside authority by whose *willing* command alone they could take effect! [In this effort, we must *not* allow ourselves to be perplexed by some such *illogical* questions as we normally hear about “who created the creator”! Especially this question encloses a logical fallacy: Logically, we may speak of things having creators *only after things are examined and found to need* creators! This process *necessarily stops at the universe, naturally* regarded as the highest category that *can* fall under our so-called “scientific” examination. God does *not* belong in this category: We *cannot* subject Him to *this* kind of examination, and therefore *cannot find* Him to need His own creator! Besides, it is a *logical* part of our conception of the Highest Logical category of Being, in which we classify God as *sole* member of His class, that He does *not* need another Creator! This is *not arbitrary, but obligatory* reasoning: Because, the Highest Logical category of Being *cannot* have a *yet higher* reference!

And finally, it is *thus* that, *beyond the troubling statistics mentioned above and the other problems already discussed*, we find *additional most powerful physical arguments* to be made regarding God and the world *from within science itself*! The era of modern science started in 1888 with the Michelson-Morley experiment. Before that, three were the important stations of classical science: Newton’s dynamics, with his law of gravitation appended; the concept of energy and its conservation, come into our consciousness gradually during the middle

of the nineteenth century; and Darwin's theory of natural selection. As for light, we *still* are left with Newton's "corpuscles", and Young's "waves"; our knowledge of its *true* nature has *not* advanced! *Without that knowledge did we agree* to move on to *other* discussions, including relativity and quantum mechanics! The arguments refer all these:

A. THE PROBLEMS OF LIGHT AND ENERGY

Energy, one of the most important concepts of modern science, was debated extensively in the mid nineteenth century, when first it was taken to conserve. It comes in many forms, among which it transforms with various degrees of efficiency. Light is regarded as the most refined form of energy; heat as the crudest; low-grade heat as an almost total waste. Except for gravitational, atomic and nuclear, all other forms of energy on earth derive their existence from the light of the sun. Most of the solar light impacting the earth transforms to heat, stored in bodies in the form of vibration of its atoms. Both light and radiant heat are recognized as forms of electromagnetic energy. The other forms of energy stand between those two, but are not regarded as electromagnetic. The thermal energy of ordinary bodies is attributed to the internal vibrations of their atoms. Chemical energy is a form of energy stored internally in atoms and molecules of reduced matter, whence it is released upon combustion. The effort to unite the forces of nature is also an effort to see all forms of energy as essentially one. Energy in all its forms is expressed in terms of $(\text{mass}) \times (\text{velocity})^2$. Newton believed light to come in *material* "corpuscles". Young, by analogy of water and air, "found" it to be "waves" of what he thought was a *material* continuum, or "ether". The Michelson-Morley experiment *proved* the "ether" nonexistent. We *still continue* to regard light as vibrations of a *continuum*! The situation was *not* "saved" by the relativity theory: "Spacetime", the *new* continuum, what "physical" remains when *all* matter (*all* mass *and* energy) *is totally* absent, has *no* material substance, *cannot*, vibrating, carry energy (*always* measured in terms of *mass and velocity*) and *cannot* cause a gravitational field (understood *only* in terms of mass, velocity, acceleration and distance between *material* bodies) to exist in *totally empty* space! In the "The Field Equations of Gravitation in the Absence of Matter" section of his 1916 paper, Einstein *explicitly specified* the word "matter" to *include* "not only matter in the ordinary sense, but the electromagnetic field as well". So, it *is* a *non sequitur* that the gravitational field, *requiring mass in order to exist and be expressed*, is taken by the theory to exist *even in the absence of mass*! It *is* a *double non sequitur* that light, a form of electromagnetic energy *thus excluded* by Einstein from the concept of "spacetime", *is nevertheless taken* to be "undulations of spacetime"! It *is* a *triple non sequitur* that light, appearing in experiments now as *particles* (photons) and now as *waves*, and *being unquestionably energy* (that *Einstein* wrote as mc^2), *is be-*

lieved to be massless! It is a quadruple non sequitur that as a result of the theory of relativity the concept of conservation of energy has definitely lost its sheen!: Because, the heretofore *conserved total* amount of energy (expressed under relativity as Mc^2 , where M is the total mass in the universe) *necessarily sums up all forms of energy!* But *how* is the summing up done *physically?* This has *never* been explained! With *all* other forms of energy remaining the same, the kinetic energy *depends on where you measure it from!* Two observers in motion relative to each other will generally *not* agree on the kinetic energy of bodies! And so, *neither* on the *total* energy of the universe! E.g., the earth as seen from the sun and the sun as seen from the earth do *not* possess equal amounts of kinetic energy, though the potential energy of the sun-earth system works out the same whether from the sun or the earth! However little liked and even less discussed, this nevertheless *is* the state of “understanding” permitted by the modern theories with which we attempt to “understand” the world and determine the “Equation of Everything”! But there is more!

The science of motion we have *invented* permits us to conceive “operations” *running backwards* in time. Though we have *never* seen a *natural* clock to run backwards (and even if we saw the sun to reverse course we would *not* develop a sense of *time* running backwards), we nonetheless feel ourselves *free* to play with the idea; *supposedly* “scientifically”, based on relativity! And based on current “knowledge” (i.e., *without true knowledge of how fundamentally world time affects world operations*), we have the temerity to run the history of the universe *in reverse*, and to *believe* operations to have taken place in the *normal* course of time, *without taking due account of all the assumptions we make tacitly in the process!* So, we *believe* there was once a time (epoch of decoupling) before which, the entire mass of the universe was hydrogen so hot as to be ionized thermally and the universe was optically opaque due to the very strong interaction of light with protons and electrons. Much further back *we must also believe* based on theory, though theory runs *very thin* as regards what happened back then, there was an era of *much* higher temperatures when *all matter and energy*, compressed unimaginably, were nevertheless *present in the form of pure radiation*; as a result of which, the universe must have then been transparent! Ordinary matter other than hydrogen is *believed* to have formed in stars *following* the age of decoupling; when due to gravitational instabilities of *unknown* origin in the gas, masses of it coagulated locally, compressed themselves under high temperatures in stars and in their interiors formed the other elements of ordinary matter. *Totally ignored* remains the *fact* that, as the original transparent pure-radiation universe cooled, *there necessarily was a first time* when the temperature and pressure *was as high as hypothesized* to have existed in the interiors of stars following the age of decoupling! Why ordinary matter did *not* form then (as it ought to have done, since thermodynamically it matters

not how the conditions are arrived at but that they *apply and result in* their effects), but *all* matter passed on to form hydrogen that *only later was recompressed* according to standing theory, this *basic inconsistency* modern science has *not* bothered to explain! But take a present-day scientist accepting, as he does with fervor, our present-day scientific knowledge of *fundamentals* to be eternally true, transform him into a non-physical observer and send him back to the era of pure radiation with orders to conduct measurements on energy and the universe. With mass *yet* to come into being, he would be at a *total* loss to say ought about the universe or the energy, that he would not even be able to see at all due to their total transparency! With these in mind, *we are logically bound to take it to be totally unscientific* to make theories claiming resolution of our questions about the universe, when, based on them, we conceive of epochs during which under *identical* conditions the *same particular result now did not obtain and now it did*, while our most fundamental *supposedly eternal* concepts would *not* be able to find their *due* correspondence with the *then* observed facts! How *little* the situation then in effect is understood is further shown by the accepted “explanation” of the so-called “background radiation”; believed to be *a direct, unaltered, and the same everywhere* remnant of the original “fireball”, rather than *the local background radiation field in which we are immersed*, as is formed by *all* universal processes to date!

The problem of energy shows up even in nuclear particle research: When particles are accelerated, they are *assumed* to consist of *only* the mass they had *before* the acceleration. When highly accelerated nuclear particles are smashed in collisions, fragments are found *heavier* than the particles from which they are supposed to be coming, in which they are *assumed* to have been contained, *extra mass even gravitationally unseen*, before the collisions! Black holes, the *supposed not quite* perfect (according to Hawking) holders of unseen matter, *do nonetheless betray* the presence of their contents by their gravitational effects on the surrounding world. *Not* so with the nuclear particles, even as they are *not* black holes! Totally unabashed by these *horrendous* logical conflicts, we proceed to make theories about nuclear and subnuclear (*so-called* “elementary”) particles, and to build hugely expensive machines intended to test these our theories, that hardly ever fail to be “verified”! Thus emboldened, our theories (that is, *we*) *continue to ignore all such conflicts*; and so far at least, we continued to build *ever bigger* particle-smashers! Early in the century, we thought we had come to the end of the particles line: The world with just the electron, the proton and the neutron seemed simple enough. The neutron did *not* present us with the above conflict: its mass *exceeds* the combined mass of the proton and electron to which it disintegrates when left in free state. The conflict arose when, after great acceleration, the nuclear particles were forcibly smashed. And we then *never* stopped “finding” *ever more, ever heavier and ever more mysterious* particles

hiding inside those early three! In fact, if all this activity is on the right track, those three represent a sort of a *bottleneck in nature*!: the “elementary” particles, perhaps hundreds in number, all hide inside those three, through which (when smashed) alone they make their presence known to the world above, that also consists of a very large number of atomic and molecular particles! As the “elementary” particles proliferated, it became obvious that, *for their sheer number alone*, they could *not all* (if *any* of them) be truly elementary! Back to the theory-drawing-board, other theories were drawn up to take care of this situation, and “particles” like quarks made their appearance (these surely only on paper, since they are supposed to dwell even deeper inside those other ones and can *never* be examined *in vero corpo*), that *again* began to proliferate much like the previous generation! In truth, *all* subnuclear particles are *never* observed *in vero corpo*: only *traces* of condensed vapors of *ordinary molecules* in cloud chambers are observed, and these traces are *interpreted* as paths of the sought after fast-moving particles, based on *heavily-assumption-laden* theories! Question: If we insist that the world is rational, on which basis alone we continue to do science, may we also continue to uphold theories about particles that make the world look progressively *irrational* as a result of all those particles *supposedly* “found” in nature? *How short, as a minimum, must the life of a particle be* in order that we may decide that we deal with a real particle, rather than with a *forced coagulation* of mass-energy that proceeds to “disintegrate” (can this be the right word in this case, or is it perhaps better to use *relax*?) the moment the mass-energy concentration-pressure falls below the corresponding certain level? Utilitarian nuclear fission and fusion work *can* proceed *without* recourse to results of work based on such “advanced” theories of nuclear “structure”. What then is the *real* value of such theoretical work, conducted moreover *without any* parallel effort to resolve the all too real physical-philosophical issues raised by it? Whatever the results of such work, *not all* reasonable people, if experience to date can guide, shall be satisfied with their interpretation! Even if Nobel prizes are dispensed! You well understand the shock, cultural *and* social, of the admission of these facts and their consequences: A great deal of current science and science-supported philosophy *must* be abandoned! And *all* those currently employed in the multi-billion-dollar industry built around the efforts of “verification” of the theories involved *must* find *other, meaningful*, employment! You well understand that the shock *shall* be all the greater the simpler is the *correct* solution of this problem, that indeed *is* simple! No amount of tact can lessen the impact, while *any* effort at tact may perhaps be taken as an insult! *Factual* language *is* the better part of valor and tact!

B. THE SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEMS OF MATTER AND ENERGY

This requires the admission of the *fact* that there are *fundamental* photons,

the *true* elementary particles, having *true*, *not* “virtual”, mass corresponding to their energy ($e_0 = m_0 c^2$)! Accordingly, *all matter and energy is made up of elementary photons*, and the supply of energy to *any* body is effected by the *addition* to it of *real* mass corresponding to the energy supplied $(\delta E) = (\delta m)c^2$. *No* theory is required to produce this simple equation; *it is necessitated only by the requirement that true mass correspond to energy as per the dimensional definition of energy, from the true elementary particle on up!* The increase of mass with velocity predicted by special relativity was first received with great skepticism. This was converted to shock, acceptance of, *belief in* the theory when particle accelerators “verified the predicted” effect. But *when mass is admitted to be delivered* to particles on acceleration, according to the above specification, *the mass of the accelerated particles comes out naturally exactly as “predicted” by special relativity, yet, without need of the theory!* Automatically, as it now becomes obvious, the quandary of “over-massive particles hiding in the nucleons but not reporting in the ordinary course of events, except on smashing”, *vanishes!* All excess mass is seen for what it truly is: *added on acceleration, not pre-existing* in there! But what does this make of *all* our currently precious theories, and of our “best and brightest”?

Let us see: With the photon massive, we are talking of a *totally New Science!* The expansion or contraction of the universe would *not* remain, as it shockingly is, *totally silent* on the fate of *all* photons out there! Light, *every single fundamental photon, must be accounted for* in *any* self-respecting theory of the universe! Remember the general relativistic theories of the re-collapsing or recurring universe: Do they say *anything at all* (based on general relativity that brought them to the fore, or on anything else) about how *light* is to be retarded to a dead stop and re-accelerated backwards? *No!* Can they be serious? *No!* Remember all the (now seen to be only fatuous) talk about the “missing mass” out there! Remember the deflection of light and the retardation of signals passing close to massive bodies “predicted” by general relativity!: The massive photon, attracted *naturally* by massive bodies, follows *not* a straight but a *curved* path (upon which travel takes *longer*), *different* from that calculated on the basis of Newtonian mechanics: The deflection comes out *exactly* as observed and “predicted” by relativity! Remember that with a massive photon, *even the velocity of light suffers cosmological retardation!* Its velocity, therefore, *cannot* remain constant as current theory *requires!* In truth, it *is* amazing how *diligently* current theory *avoids* discussing how light and the whole universe escaped the original “singularity” (of *infinite* gravitational force) with a maximum velocity of expansion limited to the *present* (if constant) velocity of light! With the *present* velocity of light, the universe could *not* have come out of the initial singularity! On the other hand, inflationary theories *are* silly! Because the total velocity of separation of bodies *includes all* effects; and it is the *total* velocity of *bodies* *sepa-*

rating that is limited by the velocity of light! A non-physical observer watching events then, as now, *would have to conclude* that the *total* velocity of separation could *not* have exceeded the velocity of light! But if you think that here we have a true quandary, please read on!

C. THE PROBLEM OF THE MICHELSON-MORLEY EXPERIMENT.

What problem? Is there a problem? But isn't there a *huge* problem? *Two major mistakes, indeed blunders, have been committed in its interpretation!* First, *totally missed was the fact* that the interferometer, carried on a pool of mercury, *in fact is only a two-dimensional analogue of a three-dimensional instrument* moving in space, *at any one moment, along a definite yet continuously variable direction with a definite yet continuously variable velocity*, due to the rotation of the earth! *Only the total velocity multiplied by the continuously variable cosine of its angle with the main axis is projected on the main axis, not the entire total velocity "is" in the direction of the main axis, of the instrument!* Second, *also totally missed was the fact* that, the *assumption* that the *entire* velocity of the instrument is along the main axis *is unreasonable!*: As the instrument turns freely on its bed, the total velocity is *not* carried along, in the *arbitrary* direction of the main axis! Moreover, as two or more instruments conducting measurements in different places on the globe generally have *both their main axes and beds disposed at angles* relative to each other, their operators *may not* therefore *assume* the *total* velocity to be in the direction of the main axis of *all instruments at once!* *Of course*, this is automatically resolved the moment the *projected* velocities are properly considered. But when this is done, the experiment *proves the true physical contraction of all bodies*: their contracted arbitrary axes relate to each other through the *sines* of the angles they form with the relatively continuously variable vector of total motion! The contraction of the x- and y- axes reduces to the classical but *generally wrong* Fitzgerald expression *only* when the x-axis is turned *parallel to the generally unknown* total velocity vector! You well realize that *had this correct analysis been carried out even as late as 1905, the theory of relativity would not have come into being*; and even if it had, the experiment *would already have shown* its lie! [Much has been written about whether Einstein knew of the Michelson-Morley experiment when he wrote his 1905 paper. But in *that* paper (see p. 46 f/note, *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover Publ. 0-486-60081-5, 1952 edition; a reprint, through special arrangement with Einstein, of the 1923 edition), *he himself referred* to what *he had thought to be but were not the Lorentz transformations!* Since Lorentz *only* developed *his* transformations in his own effort to resolve the issues raised by the experiment, it is *impossible* that Einstein did not *already* know of the subject (i.e., the experiment and its problems) in relation to which Lorentz developed *his* transformations! Einstein's own (*obviously subsequent!*) protestation of

ignorance of the experiment (loc. cit., p. 38, footnote) *cannot* be credited!] It is incredible that with so many problems relating to our most famous theories still outstanding, our “best and brightest” *continue to build on them rather than re-examine* their premises *ab initio*! *Continue*, that is, *even after 1985, when all these issues were presented to them in full, and they decided in full knowledge of the facts to suppress the findings and pretend that nothing had changed!* You well understand what the Michelson-Morley experiment says about ordinary bodies, *truly and instantaneously* contracting as they turn relative to their direction of total motion! But when you consider that they *all* are made of *fundamental* photons, that they adjust so very fast is *not* all that surprising!

D. THE PROBLEM OF NEWTON’S LAW

According to Einstein, what caused him to develop general relativity was the “inaccuracy” of Newton’s law. But has it not struck you as most odd that *we have been much too quick* to dismiss Newton’s law as “highly accurate but not exactly accurate”, when *we have not spent enough elbow grease* in determining the *causes* of its *purported* inaccuracy? Let’s review the situation: *If we look carefully* at what we call “laws of nature”, *we will be struck by the fact that, among them all, Newton’s is the only one that is free of obvious assumptions!* Mass, separation, force are *all objective* physical quantities! *Nothing* more seems to be involved in Newton’s law! The so-called gravitational constant is *nothing more but a proportionality constant*, the introduction and use of which involved *no ad hoc* assumptions! [Compared to this law, *all other laws are contingent on difficult and not well understood concepts and unverified assumptions*, such as the *pure claim* that the velocity of light is constant, or the *equally pure claim* that the photon is massless; *at least* the latter of which, was shown above, *on material already before us at the time of the Michelson-Morley experiment, yet, material then and now misunderstood*, to have been *entirely* baseless!] We have *verified evidence*, indeed *unshakable proof*, that the solar system is held together by gravitation *as defined by Newton’s law!* Kepler’s laws relate *inextricably* to Newton’s law! On account of this *sufficient* fact, *we ought to have bent double over* to discover its *purported* failure to account for the precession of planetary orbits! Which however we did *not* do, either before 1916, or after Einstein *added at least five more to his other assumptions in his effort to streamline his general relativity to Newton’s law, in order that he may then come back to claim the latter as a case of the former* to a “first approximation”! Moreover, after the discovery of universal expansion, leading directly to the initial singularity and its *infinite* field of gravitation, *we have every reason to suspect* that by *no* finite initial velocity could the universe have been set upon its subsequent expansion! *Thus, the fact that the universe is still as observed and has not already scattered to infinity cannot have been due to some cause other*

than gravitation delaying its expansion right from the start! This, in face of the fact that Hawking and Company admit the breakdown of relativity during the earliest period in the life of the universe, during which Newton's law does not break down, as it already allows for the infinite force of gravity at zero separation! Which all is all the more sufficient reason for us to redouble our effort to understand all that lies hidden in Newton's law! Which unquestionably is indeed plenty!

E. THE PROBLEM OF SEPARATION OF BODIES

First off, we see at once that what you call Mathematical and Logical Consistency *could not have failed to leave out of consideration something as universal as Newton's physical-natural law* [*physical*, as part of physics, the science; *natural*, as part of Nature, the Greek *physis*; on account of which, the hyphenated term is *naturally* given in Greek by the *sufficient* term *physical*]! When from a tiny bit of tissue, as we now find, we can reconstruct a whole living organism, surely from a Law within the Consistent Mathematical and Logical System, we ought to be able to learn *plenty*! And what we learn right off is that even this three-hundred-year-old law *has* been misunderstood! Whereas we have a *good* intuitive feeling of what a *physical* force is (as we all have felt *physical* forces), and what a *physical* mass is (as we all have held *physical* masses in our hands), and we *know* that there are *objective* quantities out there corresponding to forces and masses, the intuitive feeling we have of *physical* separations *does not automatically lead to being a law of nature* that the separation used in Newton's law must be along a Euclidean straight line! In other words, *what exactly the physical separation of bodies used in Newton's law is can only be defined by another physical law*, and *we may not assume without testing that that law dictates the Euclidean straight-line separation! What separation that other law dictates is a matter for a detailed separate investigation! We are wrong, have been wrong for three hundred years, to subsume without testing Euclidean straight-line distances operating under Newton's law! For that matter, in a dynamic system in continuous motion, how is that law to define distance, statically or dynamically? A static definition could require that at a frozen moment, perhaps, the best option is of the frozen Euclidean straight-line distance. At the next frozen moment the then frozen Euclidean straight-line distance, and so on. But how do we know what those frozen distances are when we may only judge distances by light, i.e., massive photons traveling in real time, and along curved paths due to gravity? Let me try to be as precise as I can: In a dynamic system, the frozen distance is a constantly fleeting conception, requiring for its complete grasping not only the distance itself, constantly, cosmologically, in real time, developing between the two bodies, but also the constantly, cosmologically, in real time, developing path along which we observe what we take to be that dis-*

tance, along which the photon travels under its *constantly, cosmologically, in real time developing* velocity! A dynamic definition *could* require that at a frozen moment, *perhaps*, the best option is of the distance *along the actual physical path a photon would travel under the field of gravity of the entire frozen rest of the universe* (i.e., the universe *minus* that photon) applying to *each* point along that path! A variation, *perhaps already involved automatically in this definition*, is the requirement that the light path between two bodies be the *least* path traveled in the *least* time! Perhaps, other static or dynamic definitions may be imagined. What you call Mathematical and Logical Consistency *cannot* have failed, among *all* the various options open in this regard, to pick *the one most parsimonious of means* (including the ideas of *least* path, time, energy, action) *and most economical relative to the overall objective*; without which considerations, the term “Consistency” totally *loses* its meaning! There is *no* question that, between *any two* points, light travels in the *particular path that is the most “economical” relative to something!* In other words, there is *no* question that Mathematical and Logical Consistency *is already at work having resolved all the issues involved!* The problem is we do *not* know *which that something is* and *how* Mathematical and Logical Consistency *has gone about resolving* the issues involved! How *naïve* (a *not too* stern critic in light of this discussion might even say, *irresponsible!*) the current theories are is seen by the *fact* that *nowhere* in them are these issues present! That general relativity *ignores* them *does not make them unimportant, only it too crude!* Now, you can have a better measure of how *complete* the abandon is with which our “best and brightest” keep on building their too impressive mathematical edifices—on *unsecured* ground!

How then is the problem of planetary orbital precession resolved? A planetary Keplerian orbit remains fixed in space *only* as long as the separation entering Newton’s law is *exactly the least and constant distance of the Euclidean straight line!* Any longer distance entering Newton’s law will *automatically* cause planetary precession! *Unquestionably*, the universal expansion itself, *applying to planetary orbits also, causes them not to be closed, but expanding outward spiraling and forward precessing ellipses!* If all other effects on a planetary orbit are properly accounted for in light of this discussion, but the orbital precession is *not* thereby fully accounted for, then there can be *no* question that the separation used in Newton’s law is *not* along the Euclidean straight line path, but *longer, and longer still than required by the universal expansion!* The *path of separation* as determined by its own *independent defining law* will then remain to be found out. *It is naïve to believe* that general relativity *automatically* accounts for planetary precession, when *it has ignored and not addressed in an explicit and compelling way all these issues, that under no circumstances can be made to go away!* [In his 1916 general relativity paper (*loc. cit.* p. 164), Einstein referred to an earlier (and we may judge independent of general relativistic

considerations) paper of 1915 where he gave the calculation of planetary precession. I have not seen that paper and cannot say what assumptions he made in that regard. But this *is* clear: When in the late twenties, faced with Hubble's *proof* of universal expansion which he had fought so strenuously up until then, he finally admitted "the greatest blunder of his life", it must be regarded as *an extraordinarily serendipitous pure coincidence* that as early as 1915 he had been able to account *correctly* for the precession, i.e., *without, at least*, considering the effect of universal expansion—to say nothing of the accuracy of Leverrier's calculations of residual Mercurial precession in the mid nineteenth century!]

F. THE TRUE SIGNIFICANCE OF NEWTON'S LAW

Regardless of the final resolution of the issue of planetary orbital precession, this *is* clear: Even if Newton's law is "highly accurate but not exactly accurate", because it is a law of *clearly universal* applicability, *all* universal issues *can* be approached through it in an *equally* "highly accurate if not exactly accurate" manner, leaving it for later to see what inaccuracies, if any, this examination will reveal—if, that is, Newton's law truly turns out not to be the real thing! From Newton's law, the physical dimensions of the gravitational constant turn out to be $(\text{mass density})^{-1} \times (\text{time})^{-2}$. *It is clear* that this conclusion *is totally free* of *all* considerations relating to the exact magnitude of separation. It follows that, *equally clear of them shall be all conclusions based on this stepping stone!* Based solely on *this incontrovertible dimensional fact*, we may write

$$G = \alpha (d \times t^2)^{-1},$$

where α is a numerical constant, which makes it *incontrovertible* that *just as G is a universal constant, so is the right-hand side of this equation!* But first, *what* sort of universal constant truly is G? Only as it relates to the two-body gravitational interactions, even those involving as one body *just one* fundamental photon and as the other body *the rest of the universe*, or *also* as it relates to the *one undivided universe, uni-verse in the fullest possible sense? How important this question is* becomes clear the moment we realize that since G already applies to the interactions, *if another G'* of the same physical dimensionality but different numerical value apply to the entire universe, to avoid serious trouble, the Mathematical and Logical Consistency *requires that an additional law determine* which of the two values applies in which case! Unless, Simplicity *orders that the two G-s be not only dimensionally but also numerically identical!* If Simplicity *does not* so order, *this shall become obvious at once through some inconsistency* the moment we try to apply the known value of G to the whole universe! [Having in mind specifically the arguments already presented in this paragraph, and preparing the way for what follows, it is important at this point to remember Plato's *always standing* challenge: "Let anyone (find fault in and) better what we here say, and the friendly wreath of victory shall be his"! Mathema-

tical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity *are unforgiving mistresses that never miss a step!* Commit *one* mistake and a *myriad other ones* follow! Overlook an *important* detail, and wherever the road takes you shall *not* be the Truth! Do we doubt the application even of Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity? We can only find out their power *if we put them to the test, against the wall, by calling their bluff!* But it goes without saying that *we cannot test them without at the same time also testing our own logical consistency and honesty!* On the road we have embarked, *the stakes are so high that we may not be lenient even towards ourselves!*] And *now* second, *what must the d and t be* that make the right-hand side of the above expression a *universal* quantity? *Incontrovertibly*, for the product $d \times t^2$ to be a universal quantity, the *d* and *t* *must themselves be* universal quantities, and no other than *D* (the *average mass density* in the universe) and *T* (the *age of the universe*) respectively! *No other* mass density and time period can be suggested of *universal* significance! And note this: The present specification *leaves the mass distribution to be determined*; it does *not* fix it in the manner of current theory requiring a *uniform* mass distribution! Now, remembering that $D = M/V$, the above expression is written as

$$G = \alpha(DT^2)^{-1}, \text{ or } V = \alpha^{-1}GMT^2,$$

which *incontrovertibly* permit *only eight* ways in which the *constant or variable* *G*, *M*, *V*, *D* and the *variable* *T* can be combined! Careful examination *eliminates all options other than G and M both constant, as either self-inconsistent or inapplicable to this universe!* Which makes it *incontrovertible* that, *as derived solely from Newton's law of gravitation, and consistently with it, the universe expands smoothly and monotonically: having started from zero at zero universal age, its volume increases with the square of its age!*

Now, *what* happened at zero universal age? And *can we be at all sure* of anything that did happen then? First, *we can be sure* that, consistent with the above, whatever happened happened *in totally free space as we understand it in the strictest sense!*: Obtained *solely* from Newton's law, *the above expression speaks only of the volume of the universe, NOT of space!* On the *Newtonian fact* that the entire universe was then confined in zero volume, *we can categorically state that the surrounding (and entire) space both then and always was/is free of everything physical (pertaining to mass, length and time)!* Beyond this, *we may not speculate on space!* Second, *equally categorically, we can therefore state that it was in free space that the universe was set on its course, subject only to its internally applicable laws operating smoothly from zero age!* Third, with the universe started on its course in free space *explosively or not* (of which in a moment), *also applicable from the start along with the above laws, we must take the law of conservation of (instantaneous) momentum!* It seems to me *inexplicable and suspect how totally this law has been overlooked* in relation to the expansion of the universe in the context of current theories!: It is clear

that, unless a body is given a *physical push from outside*, it *cannot* get started on a translational motion! As *nothing* was/is *physical* outside the universe, translational motion was/is *out of the question*! Therefore, *all* subsequent motion was obtained from *within* the universe, *with all impulse supplied from within, under the operation of this last law*! Fourth, as a direct consequence, *there was and remains a permanently static point* at which the law of universal momentum took effect! *It is the point at which all (partial) momentum vectors sum up to zero! This point is no other than the center of the universe! It is clear that Newton's law establishes both an absolute spatial reference at the point of zero total momentum, and an absolute temporal reference at the zero age of the universe! Which sufficiently and incontrovertibly proves fallacious the entire theory of relativity, built on the explicit denial of the existence of absolute spatial and temporal reference!* Einstein's effort to "show" Newton's law a case of his relativistic "gravitation" (remember those five ad hoc assumptions) *did not uncover his true greatest blunder!* Further comment is not needed, except to say that, *it is the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity that sweep clear the floor* of so much twentieth century "science"! The rest *must be silence!* Fifth, with the universe in free space and the law of momentum operating, if the universe signaled its birth with a flash of light, *necessarily*, that *first light* was broadcast as a *perfect sphere*! Do we wish to deny that *light was the first (and spherical) product of universal expansion*? Then, *we must take it as a fact that matter heavier than light traveled at first faster than light! That the velocity of light was not always limiting!* I don't think that *anything relativistic* that is currently believed can be saved by taking this line *when all relativity is now crumbling!* The conclusion is *inescapable*: At first, the universe broadcasted *the first light!* Sixth, the first light *necessarily at all times constitutes the spherical front of the expanding universe!* What happened in the beginning *cannot later be recalled!* Under the *continuous* operation of the law of momentum, *nothing subsequent* can skew into aspherical the expanding front! [And it goes without saying that, *we shall never be able to see the front or anything that happened before a certain substantial age*: First, in order to see the front, *light must come back to us from the front, which is impossible*, as it would require that the front, under the *local* application of the law of momentum, *accelerate to a superluminal velocity simply in order to be able to send back to us some of its light!* Second, we can *only* see as far as the radius at which matter *had already reached* when light from it started back towards us: The age of the emission of light and the time light has since been in transit towards us *must sum up to the present age* of the universe! Current theory has missed these facts too!]

The sixth fact permits us to express the universal volume in terms of the universal radius of the first-light front:

$$R = (3GMT^2/4\pi\alpha)^{1/3}$$

From this: First, we note a *cube of lengths to square of times relationship, analogous to that already known* from Kepler's laws! Second, we obtain the velocity of expansion of the front of the universe, being no other than the velocity of first light:

$$c = dR/dT = (2/3)(3GMT^{-1}/4\pi\alpha)^{1/3} = 2R/3T$$

Third, we obtain the rate of deceleration of the universal expansion, that is no other than the rate of deceleration of first light:

$$\begin{aligned} d^2R/dT^2 &= -(1/3)(2/3)(3GMT^{-4}/4\pi\alpha)^{1/3} \\ &= -(1/3T)(dR/dT) \\ &= -(2/9)(R/T^2), \end{aligned}$$

that *cannot be due to any other cause than the field of universal gravity*:

$$\mathcal{G} = -GM/R^2$$

producing

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= 1/6\pi, \\ D &= (6\pi GT^2)^{-1}, \\ D_{\text{now}} &= 5.45 \times 10^{30} \text{ gcm}^{-3} \text{ (} T_{\text{now}} = 12 \text{ billion years),} \\ R_{\text{now}} &= 1.70 \times 10^{28} \text{ cm} = 18 \text{ billion light years,} \\ Rc^2 &= 2GM, \\ M &= 1.15 \times 10^{56} \text{ grams.} \end{aligned}$$

While, in order to have the *same* velocity of light everywhere in the universe at constant age, it is necessary that the *same* field of gravity apply everywhere as at the universal front, which produces the *local* density as a function of the reduced local radius $\rho = r/R$

$$d = (9\pi\rho GT^2)^{-1}.$$

Only some of these findings are immediately recognized from another context: E.g., the Einstein-deSitter solution of general relativity, giving $6\pi GT^2d = 1$ but for a universe of *vanishingly small* mass expanding with an *ever increasing* velocity, and the Schwarzschild radius $R_s = 2Gm/c^2$ of a black hole, here found applying to the entire universe being the ultimate white hole! The numerical values of average mass density and total mass fall *within* an order of magnitude of our best present estimates, obtained with so much effort! But here, the “fate” of the universe, that remains so much in doubt under current theory, *is decided specifically!* The fact alone that the present procedure produces these values from no other than Newton's law under the above *tight* reasoning *is altogether remarkable to be fortuitous!* Are we to insist that, only a “highly accurate but not exactly accurate” law produces all these results? *Why then has general relativity missed all these specific statements, if it is more accurate? Why has it not exceeded them in strictness and specificity? Why no other theory has produced anything close to these results?* Many scientists have discussed the *need of a “strong” integral theory making strict specific predictions!* Here, *such* predictions obtain *directly from Newton's law*; while *it is to be doubted* that *any* theory, sought in

the manner of Hawking and Company, shall ever produce so “*strong*” and *specific* results! Plato would say: “Let anyone produce something better!” Let anyone *pretend* to be doing science while ignoring Newton’s law and its twin law of universal expansion *already verified by Hubble, both now seen to demand and establish in unsurpassed strictness both a spatial and temporal absolute reference* that *demolishes* the foundation of relativity theory! He *cannot* be any other than a mere *pretender*! Please note that it is not *I* that says so! It is only the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity! I only put all these down to show *how truly simple things are in all their magnificence*, that the official science of our century *has missed totally*! Why? Because *it only gave lip service* to the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity that *exists out there*! As you speak of Truth, please let me ask you: can we ever reach Truth while *stubbornly ignoring these facts, made available to the scientific community, that has mutely ignored and suppressed them since 1985 (from Central New Jersey where I too lived and had worked on these ideas since 1974)*?

At which point, you will surely ask: But *why* did they act so? The reason is clear: It is *not just* that the twentieth century science is thus shown to have diverted itself *fruitlessly and embarrassingly* to a dead end! Rather, it is its “*philosophy*” that stands exposed, having always claimed that other than this present universe nothing exists, and caused even Einstein not just to commit his *admitted* “greatest blunder”, but the *far far greater* blunder of *his entire relativistic scheme*, before which that other one now pales!: Because, examined closely, the above relationships prove *conclusively* that the physical-natural laws observed to be obeyed by matter are *not* its properties!: Just one example suffices: Light and all matter is shown to be made up of fundamental photons. But the law of its velocity (that *never caused any anxiety* to current science as to *how it can possibly apply forever constant*!) is now seen to depend *not on the mass of the fundamental photon, but on the mass of the entire universe; and besides, on Newton’s (now proven true) constant and the age of the universe*! The Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity of the above expressions show them to be *neither* of the fundamental photon *nor* of the universe as a whole as we have understood it up until now! The universe is *not* made up of mass, length and time, as science has claimed so far; but rather of mass, G and its *measured* age! What we had thought was a mere proportionality constant is now shown to be a *fundamental* ingredient of the universe! While *length has no independent existence* as another “dimension” of the physical world, but is a *derived dimension dependent on those other three*! While what we call physical time is *nothing other than the age of the universe*, that has *not always* been around! The mere fact that what we thought was a mathematical proportionality constant (and of dubious nature at that) is now found to be fundamental shows that the laws of “nature” are *not just* properties of matter, but *laws in the strictest sense of the*

word, obeyed by the *entire universe from the fundamental photon on up!* Although we have a *direct* sense of mass and of the age of *ourselves and of the universe* in terms of what we call “time”, *we cannot have a direct but only indirect* sense of G, the fundamentality of which can *no longer* stand in doubt! Which brings into sharp focus the next question: Were these laws thought up by, brought into being by, in order that they be obeyed by, communicated to its members by, imposed on its members by, and reported on by its members to, the universe? Or were they imposed by an *outside*, the *only other remaining*, Authority, the one we call God? In the first case, *all machinery needed* for thinking up these *mathematically and logically consistent simple laws*; their being brought into being; their being disseminated to members; and the reporting back on by its members; on a *very complex and foolproof* communication network extending from the center to the front of the expanding universe and permitting of *infinite* transmission velocity (since *only thus* can the universal laws have an *immediate moment-by-fleeting-moment application everywhere*); *these all and perhaps more must be present and must therefore be physically discoverable within the universe!* Given the above findings, *the atheists would jump with glee, if* these other physical desiderata were there and at their disposal! Well, they are *not!* And because they are *not*, there remains *a one only* conclusion, coming in two parts: The first being that, the universe could *not* bring the laws of nature into being on its own! The second being that, *therefore*, God is the outside law-imposing Authority, whose existence *is ipso facto and sufficiently proven* by the operation of the universe *under these mathematically and logically consistent simple laws!* But the atheists *would/will not* admit this finding! They are *first and only* atheists! *Honest, they are not!* On the other hand, *my total inability to find even one* “agnostic”, in a position of authority within the scientific establishment, *willing* to take it at its word of intellectual honesty and integrity, *exposes the entire sorry myth of the existence of such an animal!* The Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity *is too tough a nut* for the scientific establishment to crack *and* keep their teeth! So, *in pure primate fashion*, they did the next best thing they knew: They *suppressed the news and have since refused* to give my findings their deserved hearing!

G. THE PROBLEMS OF CURRENT QUANTUM MECHANICS

The theory of quantum mechanics is the prime example in the annals of human thought of *how little the obvious deeper issues* of existence and Logic have influenced the development of a most substantial branch of science, and of *how resolutely those issues are refused* scientific consideration! To this latter, I have already alluded. Now, I must lay bare what the scientists in this most unique case *have determined to take unquestioned*. First off, I find it most curious that *no link* has been made between quantum theory and the ancient Democritean

atomic theory, *that in truth was the first quantum theory!* When Democritus spoke of the *atom*, he *only* spoke of the *minimum fundamental particle of matter*; in other words, of the *quantum* of matter! In his days, the great variety of chemical and subchemical particles was unknown, but even if it were known, the ancient Greek sense of Simplicity *would have remained unimpressed!* *Before us still is a fundamental philosophical choice* between two options: *Which kind of creation is simpler and most elegant*, the one that creates a *one only kind of fundamental particle/building-block* and *all the rest of complexity by a combination according to law of the needed number of such similar particles*; or the other that creates *many kinds of fundamental particles* and *combines according to a then necessarily much more complex law many numbers of each kind with many numbers of other kinds* to build up the observed complexity? *How are we to choose between these two*; the second of which *is obviously far more demanding of effort in imagination, invention, creation, combination* under a mathematically and logically consistent law, *and management*, than the first?

Would you say that “it depends”? But on *what*? On what you *intend to do* with your creation? [I determine to use the *impersonal* terms *you* and *your* for the *compelling immediacy* they *impose* on us all in our facing these issues.] If so, *of course you see at once the purpose-driven cart of Design!* Do you want to avoid this cart, *fearing it smacks too much of God to suit your taste?* First off, *why do you deny this universe itself the possibility to desire something and adjust itself to its desire?* Don’t we too do very much the same? Or is it that you *sense this to be impossible* for the universe, before even you examine the scientific requirements of this possibility; which leaves you with the *only other* option of God, that you do *not* like? If so, *please suggest something else* on which “it depends”! To save yourself possible embarrassment, what you suggest *must be reasonable!* The predicament becomes obvious! You see, the ancient thinkers lived in daily intercourse with the *artful* practical creators! Modern theoretical physicists live in a world all their own! The ancients *judged logically* their options *uninhibited by theological consequences!* The moderns *subjugate* their “logic” to their *unconfessed desire to avoid even a slight insinuation of theological meaning!* Hawking and Company try fervently to devise a scheme that will make the Creator superfluous! As the *invention and proof* of such a scheme *must inevitably exceed* a scientist’s lifetime, as it now becomes obvious given the limitations at least of practical experimentation, *any scientist so spending his time must be held to account for possible mismanagement of it*, unless he *can* show that he could *not* have spent it more profitably for mankind in another field of endeavor, *given the fact that it is mankind that foots the bill!* Since he *cannot* show that his effort will *ever* reach a *conclusive* dead end (in Popper’s sense) that will *thus foreclose* the option of Creatorless existence (that *would be valuable for mankind to know* even as it would be *negative* in nature), the accu-

sation that *said effort is driven by the desire to avoid rather than meet the need* of the Creator *cannot* be shaken off! Therefore, unless we make *all* our scientific effort *blind* to *possible* theological consequences, we *cannot* show that our science as so far developed has truly been our best option!

It is this sort of *beneficial* blindness that points inexorably to the option of a *one only kind* of fundamental particle; which has *not* been what the modern quantum theory (*contrary* to the ancient!) truly even if subconsciously insinuates! Indeed, *it must be deemed a lame* “mathematical and logical consistency and simplicity” that *overlooks* these *basic* issues! The Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity that is truly worthy of our consideration and is logically taken to reside in the Mind of God *cannot but opt* for a *one-only-kind-of-fundamental-particle* universe; *unless of course, and in keeping with overall parsimony and economy, the desired objective was more demanding of means than all that such a universe could possibly give!* Which, however, *will take us too far afield if we cannot, as we surely cannot, show cause!*

Ignoring *all these most pertinent issues*, the modern quantum theory is *indeed a most peculiar collection of fundamentally illogical ideas!* Ignoring the *need* that the physical quantum be conceived *also as a definite package of a definite amount of matter and energy coming in a definite volume*, and *not only of action coming regardless* of these other qualities and quantities, modern theory *has stuck, adhering tenaciously and stubbornly* (with well-hidden *bad cause!*), to the so-called Heisenberg uncertainty principle, expressed *most peculiarly and illogically* in terms of an expression of *not less than a certain amount of action!* To an unbiased observer, our recalcitrant cynic *will observe*, the Heisenberg expression *is nothing other than the law of least action*, reexpressed *unawares* of its significance in the micro-world, after Planck *also unawares* had rediscovered its application in nature, this time most significantly coming in the form of *the definite least* of his “constant” h ! Which modern science, uses *in a totally other context, without bothering to explain how* (i.e., in terms of *Logic*) the *idea and law* of least action can possibly relate to, *and only to*, the “principle of uncertainty”! With this, our critic will further comment that, the term *science* used in this context *is* rather gratuitous!

Then again, *why* should the Planck h be a *true* constant? On *what solid arguments* do scientists apply the notion of a *constant* Planck “constant” back to the age of the initial singularity? Back then, it *cannot* logically have been otherwise than that *both* the least action as the minimal step of action possible *and* the total action of the universe were *both* zero! *Sufficiently*, because *nothing had yet happened*, as *all time and all action* was then in the future! By *what law* then did, *if it did*, the least action *suddenly* come in the amount of the Planck h ? Imagine the *first* moment of time, of duration dt following the Big Bang at $t = 0$. I.e., with the clock *already marking the continuous flow of time*. Now imagine dt

so short that multiplied by de (the *entire* amount of energy in the universe) it produces a quantity of action *less* than h ! During that period, *even the entire universe could still produce absolutely nothing!* Would you try to escape the quandary by saying that this is a good argument for the “quantization” of time? But *how*, with *absolutely nothing yet* happening, could the universe *mark out even the first* quantum of time? Doesn’t the marking out itself *involve action, being itself action?* It challenges not just imagination but also *logic* to conceive of time quanta laid out one after the other *serially and distinctly yet without break* between them! *Any break at all would involve a void in time, unbridgeable even by the entire universe*, since “during” it (or if the term offends, “*temporally within*” it!), *the entire universe would of necessity remain inactive!* Would you say that the breaks could involve no void in time, by being of zero “duration”? But *how* could that differ at all from the *time continuum*? For the universe to be *always* active, *it is necessary* that the time continuum have *no break at all!* But then, with the clock running, *it is necessary that the universe produce action even during however short a period of time one cares to imagine!* But this does mean that the Planck constant *can only have risen gradually to its present value*, having started out with the value of *zero* at the instant $t = 0$ of the Big Bang! Then again, action is involved in the activity not just of the entire universe, *but even of the fundamental particle/photon*. And under Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity, *least* action means a *common measure, a one-only measure* of least action! Thus, *any minimal activity at all* (be it of the fundamental particle/photon, or of ordinary bodies being made up of no other than light, or even of the entire universe) *must only come in the contemporaneous least measure*; while *more than minimal simultaneous activities must only come in multiples of the contemporaneous least measure*; and *the total activity to date must come as the sum of the activities to date of all the particle/photons in the universe*, each having a present value *measured in terms of the contemporaneous value of the action quantum!*

The problem of the principle of indeterminacy has two more aspects: First, in its form of $(dx)(dp) \geq h$, the principle *denies not just an exact knowledge by us, but the existence itself, of an exact momentum for the entire universe very early on in the life of the universe*, when one is again free to imagine *such a short size* for the universe immediately following the Big Bang as to keep the above product *less* than h , considered by the current theory forever fixed at its present value! Thus, the theory *denies the simultaneous existence of both the exact position* of the center of the universe *as the zero point of zero total momentum*, which is *unquestioned* under the law of momentum, *and the then also exact velocity* (given its constant mass), under which, at the instant $t = 0$, the universe started on its expansion, without which *it would not even know how to behave during all subsequent times!* And second, it *denies not just the possibil-*

ity for the universe to react, *but indeed the unquestioned fact* that the universe *does react with total knowledge*, to the action of *any one body* within it, on account of which fact alone we are able to measure the *inertial* mass of a body and find it equal to its *gravitational* mass! The existence of *exact and constant* inertia (the *fact* of which is *not* exhausted within the limits of the present discussion!) *proves the ability of the universe to deliver its exact reaction at an exact address!* But under Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity, we *cannot have both* our quantum dog fed *and* our universal pie whole, *unless the quantum facts are other than as now believed!* Before the “*immovable rock*” of *unquestioned universal facts*, it is the *current* quantum theory that *must yield and get corrected!* It is remarkable that *it is exactly this rock* that modern science under cover of quantum theory attempts to swallow! Surely, *when it forbids even the last iota and dot to be out of place*, Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity *cannot* tolerate such behavior!

Of all the above, *no discussion at all has ever taken place* in the context of the presently accepted quantum theory! Just as *no discussion has ever seen the light of day* respecting the relation of amount of mass contained in the particles and their geometrical size! The largest of sorts, if composite, body is surely the entire universe, of a huge geometrical size! *What* then would you say *is* the geometrical size of the fundamental particle/photon? *How tiny or large* would you say it is? Here too, another of our assumptions, *scientifically unwarranted yet accepted by scientists*, requires that the least massive particle also be the tiniest! The quandary of more mass hiding individually in particles than the particles reveal when weighed as packages, I have already discussed. I now will discuss the *parallel* problem of the *geometrical* size of the particles and bodies in the universe: The neutron is *both heavier and smaller* than the *entire* hydrogen atom! [Remember: deuterium is *not* hydrogen!] Similarly, back at the initial singularity, the *entire* universe, the heaviest body that ever existed, was *all* contained in the “room” of *zero* volume! The wavelengths of more energetic photons *surely* are *smaller* than those of less energetic ones! These examples *suffice to show that compatible with Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity there is out there an inverse relationship of mass and geometrical size* (to which even the *speculated* black holes are subject)! Surely then, our current science *has a lot to explain*: Except for those it *assumes* exist in the nucleus, for which it *reverses* the rule, it regards *all* less massive particles to be *smaller!*: Example, the electron! Yet it *avoids to discuss honestly and exhaustively* the problem of action at a distance, *necessarily present* between massive particles having *both* tiny volumes *and* standing apart! Example, *the proton and electron within the hydrogen atom*; in which case *undoubtedly only for the sake of electrostatic attraction between those two* has the invention of a “bonding particle” been resisted! It *invented* “curved spacetime” in order *to avoid* the problem of action at a

distance, *alleging* the force of gravity at *all* distances to be an *illusion*! It has *ignored* the *very same* problem in the case of *electrostatic* charges! It *invented* such particles as “gluons”, “strings”, “hooks” on which other particles latch, to *mediate* the interactions of other *tiny* particles standing *at a distance within the nucleus*! It thereby *insinuates* the existence of a *whole menagerie* of geometrically-tiny *and* geometrically-extensive particles; *needing* the latter to hold the former together in a scheme designed to *avoid* the action at a distance; *which it hates for never discussed purely theological reasons*! *How* such menagerie meshes with Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity, *which it only insults*, this, too, modern science leaves unmentioned! [As to the still hanging question of the size of the fundamental photon, let me here just state that *cogent arguments show it to be equal to that of the entire universe*!]

The modern quantum theory was founded on Planck’s work on the black body radiation, Einstein’s work on the photoelectric phenomenon, Rutherford’s conception of the atom, and Bohr’s early quantum theory of the hydrogen atom. As I have already discussed the Planck h , let me here continue with Rutherford’s conception of the atom: Even before the principle of uncertainty was enunciated, it ought to have come into the common scientific consciousness that the notion of the atom being either a tiny solar system, or a chaotic system as the subsequent “new” quantum theory insinuates, of a nucleus with satellites revolving around it, *is contrary to the observed facts*; on which *sufficient* grounds, *it ought to have been rejected*! At all times, as *all* sorts of microscopic work has shown, the atom *is* a sphere! *Contrary to this fact*, the notion of a solar system adopted for the atom makes the atom a *very thin and empty* “disk”; which, coupled with the notion of a tiny nucleus and tiny electrons, reduces the hydrogen atom to a *mere dipole, in space, many times thinner and emptier in proportion than the sun-earth system*! While it reduces the heavier atoms either to systems of particles at least as thin and empty in space as the solar-system “disk”, or to systems of particles chaotically scattered and scuttering in almost empty space, as current theory lets be understood! I.e., with the idea of a sphere *nowhere in sight, contrary*, I repeat, *to the observed facts*! This is *not exactly similar* to the case of your grandfather’s oak chair: In that case, you contrasted the problematical human sensory experience to the highly magnified scientific “picture” of the chair! In this case, *it is the scientific pictures themselves that are at odds with each other*!: Under the electron microscope, the atoms *ought not to be seeable as spheres* of size about 10^{-8} cm, *if* current theory were correct! *If* the electron is of size about 10^{-13} cm, the *true* resolution of the electron microscope *is of equal size*, and the picture *ought not to be of the atom as a whole, but of its individual nucleus and electrons*! But *we do not see them* under the microscope!

Though the electron microscope had not yet been invented in 1913 when Bohr proposed his “old” quantum theory, *the main facts and the understanding*

of their nature were already in place; as was, or ought to have been co-developing, the substance of the above arguments! At any rate, Bohr lived to see the electron microscope and observe things under it; but he *never* revised his view of things! It will be a *gross slander* to his intelligence to state that he played the central figure in the development of the *still dominant* “Copenhagen interpretation” under *any* illusions! It will be an *equal gross slander* to the intelligence of those who followed him to state that they still operate under *any* illusions! But *what* does that leave us with? What other than that *they deliberately insist on it for a reason?*

The “old” quantum theory was abandoned *not* for its geometrical problems but for the fact that *it could not be made to apply numerically* to other atoms. The “new” theory, incorporating the three-dimensional Schrödinger “wave-function”, permitted numerical calculations on the energies of other atoms by the variational method; and Hylleraas used it *with the embarrassingly high number of fourteen specifically adjusted parameters* in order to *calculate a value* for the total ionization potential of the helium atom *reasonably close* to the value experimentally observed! But not only did the “new” theory *not* resolve the geometrical problem, it *compounded* it! For one thing, it *retained intact* the idea of the “old” theory that the atom ionizes *from a radius extending to infinity, no less, and thus engulfing the entire universe!* Which is so obviously wrong as our use of electricity is secure, *that would be an impossibility if* the negative charges had to be removed to infinity, not even just to the edges of the universe; as well as flies in the face of our common experience and the theory of free electrons in metals! For another, with the electron *assumed tiny*, the problem of many electrons revolving around the nucleus becomes an *exactly-unsolvable* many-body problem, that can *only* be attacked by *approximation* methods! For yet another, it is in the nature of the Schrödinger “wave-function” that *it do not deal with the real physical things* (in this case, the electrons) but with their *presumed* “probability” that they are where calculated! This *while there exists no objective method for the experimental verification of the prediction of this probability!* The *real* electrons in the *real* atom *were thus and most conveniently replaced* (though only in our own willing minds, where alone the reality and the probabilistic concept are willfully mixed together and their distinction is *cunningly blurred*) by their “probabilities” in “probability space” in which alone the so-called “electron cloud” lives! For a fourth thing, how *limited* the improvement allowed by the “new” theory truly is can be seen when recalling how *limitedly* in space are distributed the probability density lobes or “orbitals” of such *common* electronic states as the 2p, 3d, or 4f even of the hydrogen atom, which in fact mean that the probability of finding the electron *in any of all other* directions *is strictly nil*, which in turn means that the nucleus is *not ever* covered by the electron *in any of all those other* directions! *Only* for such as the *rearer* 1s,

or 2s states is the probability density spherically distributed around the nucleus! Still, in *real time*, *absolutely nothing* did change! Rather than the “new” theory *proving the atom always spherical when unperturbed, as is logically required, it instead retained the dipole, just as before!* For a fifth thing, on top of all the above, now introduced was the *chaotic scuttering scatter* of the electron or electrons around the nucleus! *Forgotten* was the old principle that when unperturbed, a body (*and thus also the electron*) carries on as before! The “new” theory *never* bothered to explain *what it is* that causes the electron to jump from one place to another in an *unperturbed* atom! For *without a physical cause causing* such jumping, the electron *must remain in its fixed trajectory*, and the three-dimensional spatial, if limited, probability distribution *must collapse into a near two-dimensional one*, and that in the shape of a *very thin ring!* [While it takes a string of about 74000 pearls each the size of the earth to fill its trajectory around the sun, it takes a string of about 314000 pearls the size of the electron to fill *its least* trajectory around the nucleus! The probability of finding the *unperturbed* satellite *outside* its respective ring *remains exactly zero at all times!*] And for a sixth thing, to make an already bad situation even worse, after they were armed with the “new” theory, the quantum mechanics began attempting to make us believe that the *real* electron “can and does” jump *unpredictably* from place to place *without having to go through any other intermediate place at all!* [It in fact was of *this* idea that the Star Trek trick was born according to which people could be “energized” and transported from place to place! Well, the Hollywood folks did *not completely* lose their minds!: They at least made said transportation *exact-to-a-minutely-predetermined-place* (*down to the scale of the atoms and all levels below*, as otherwise, the *exact* “reconstitution” of people even in the bowels of planets *would be impossible!*), *not totally unpredictable*, as the quantum mechanics *insist* happens in the case of the electron!]

Does all this make dizzy all people other than quantum mechanics? Of course, but in fact *less than them!*: For *it is their greater dizziness* that makes them take the final step into the nether land of make believe while all other folks remain skeptical!: For it is *they* that, in order that *they first* get out of this terrible predicament, crown all this confusion *by further insisting that we must think of the electron as a mere mathematical concept!* I.e., *that we forget the reality out there* and think *only of the equations themselves* as the *only* “reality”! This while *it is physical experiment* that measures such things as the *real* charge and mass of the electron, and there *never before or since* has in the annals of science been argued, let alone shown, that mathematical concepts have *real, physically measurable* masses, just as you or I! Where before the materialist argument had been “*show me, the real thing!*”, now the “scientific” argument has become “*here ‘is’ the probability cloud; therefore, believe!*” And it is in order to strengthen this their position that they also insist stubbornly on the “uncertainty principle”, *even as it is only the least action law!*

What is *all the more remarkable and infuriating* to see done by scientists is their insistence that we may *not* look further into the nature of things, for “there is nothing more in the nature of things than just this”! Which, however, has *not* stopped them from milking the social cow for precious funds, *most frivolously spent*, if they are right, in their high energy physics work, where the existence of things *can never be ascertained but only conjectured even after expensive “successful” experiments, and nobody but very few and of their own* can “test” the truth of Nobel-prize caliber work! I, as an engineer, *am discipline-bound* to belong in the category of “*show me, the real thing!*”, and to draw from my engineering experience, *which is no other than common, yet disciplined*, experience!: As an applied industrial engineer, I have worked in mines and done precise underground geodetic work needed for the exact positioning, in the solid bowels of the earth burrowed hollow, of galleries and shafts and other facilities. But as an applied research engineer, I have also done work at high temperatures and determined solubilities of elements in solid and liquid metals from steel and above down to sodium; in which, *small amounts of dissolved oxygen will cause corrosion in the stainless steel container, that will cause a fast breeding nuclear reactor, denied cooling as a result of corrosion and corrosion-induced fatigue and failure, to blow up in the space of two seconds!* These show the need for precise work, geometrical the one, quantitative the other. Whence the question: *Where does nature stop, or begin from, caring about precise work?* Even if it is argued that all macroscopic work is at a level above the Planck h , dilute chemical solutions work such as is involved in fast breeding nuclear reactors *most certainly is not!* The Planck h *figures significantly* in chemical reaction kinetics. Therefore, *if nature stops, or begins, caring from some level, that level cannot but be within the limits even of my work!* So, even such as I ought to be greatly concerned about indeterminacy, and *are by the nature of their work entitled* to voice their opinion on the matter; which, as is here shown, is *not* the exclusive domain of quantum mechanicians! Besides, as nature *most certainly is of one kind, the same* for quantum mechanicians and astronomers, *so too she is the same for engineers!* Therefore, *only fools may dismiss as out of place the legitimate concerns of engineers!* But my engineering experience teaches more: For I have yet in my professional life to see certainty built on uncertainty, *unless there is a law underneath that resolves the uncertainty into certainty!* Take the simple experience of *all*, that, *all* games of chance rely on their intrinsic uncertainty. The cause of which however, *no intelligent human may misunderstand!* That uncertainty *is itself built on certainty!* E.g., *the certainty of equal probability* of heads or tails in the throw of a coin! Which *depends entirely and can only be secured upon the underlying law of construction of the good coin!* I refer here to this *fact* because, though probability and uncertainty play an *important* role in science (and not only in the context of the present discussion) and

engineering (where the assurance of the quality of industrial products *is often studied statistically*), not only every common human, but, *obviously, not even every famous scientist, knows, fully appreciates and respects the fact* that, historically, their scientific study began with the study, by Gauss, of what *truly* happens in the *common* games of chance, *that are all built on the certainty of the strict law of good construction* of such things as coins, dice and packs of cards! Even the *famous* quantum mechanics *willfully ignore* this truth!: They insist on the probability being primary when *it is only derivative, of intent based on certainty!* [In the case of casinos, the *intent* of profit, and the *certainty* that the operators *shall not* lose their own shirts!] And they *refuse to explain how* if uncertainty is primary in nature, *that uncertainty* brought about the *certainty* of their own “principle” of uncertainty; which *certainty* they *cannot and do not practically ignore* in insisting on the primacy of their “principle of uncertainty”!

But there is more of the same vein in what quantum mechanics claim: An engineer *must produce safe works!* In the face of catastrophe, he *cannot* excuse himself on chance, probability, or quantum uncertainty! He *goes to prison for negligence!* The quantum mechanics (at least the atheists and agnostics among them, in whose ranks *not curiously* are found the most eminent of them), *free* from the practical legal consequences of their statements, also feel themselves free to *deny, because this is exactly what they all along have been trying to deny, the existence of underlying laws that unite all nature under certainty!* In the language of engineering drawings, the components depicted *are clearly told apart*, and the contractor *knows, based on the drawings*, what comes first, what next! *So* are the works, houses, bridges, ships, airplanes, even super-conducting super-colliders, built! That people use and enjoy *safely!* This *is practical responsibility!* *It is in this same vein that we may not lose sight of the fact that far more than equally safe also is the natural world in which we live, play, work, produce safe works, construct theories!* How that *safety* came out of their quantum uncertainty, the quantum mechanics under the *presumed* protection of their uncertainty principle *have not felt themselves honor bound to explain!* Instead, with *far less* verisimilitude than of magicians bringing doves out of hats, and with *no respect for the “hard facts of nature”* (in B. Russell’s sense), they claim that *safe and certain* reality “just” sprang up out of their “probability cloud”! But by so doing, they *also* present an inexorable dilemma: That for the *hidden cause of their claims and refusals of responsible explanation, we choose between innocent confusion and infernal intent!* But to excuse them on however innocent confusion and in so doing accuse them of puerile “muddled thinking” (in B. Russell’s sense) *would be an insult both* to their experience of the world *and* to their intelligence! Alas, for *their total absence of anxiety* over these matters for the greatest part of this *least innocent, most experienced, and most sophisticated* century, we are left in the *no-choice* situation of *their infernal in-*

*tent! The intent of in the name of science covertly claiming, and the innocent though only the gullible persuading of, while lacking the manly courage of themselves openly stating, the nonexistence of the He Engineer Himself! Only this, no other, is their **most ancient** reason!*

It was with *this* analysis in mind, *all based on nothing other than the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity*, that I presented myself with my own dilemma: *Either to show them wrong in their own game, or just shut up accusing them of this heinous intent!* If, I reasoned, Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity exists and is operative in the world, it *cannot* fail to show them wrong!

I *had* to start with the Rutherford-Bohr conception of the atom as a miniature-solar-system model: If the atom shows itself to be spherical (as it *most successfully does specifically in our too wide to be ignored crystalline-metalurgical experience*), it *cannot but be* spherical! The idea, therefore, of the Rutherford-Bohr model *had, has, to go!* Even if in the process, *all conceptual structure intrinsically built on that model also has to go!* I *had* to return to the Lorentz idea of the electron as a hollow sphere, which, as will here be shown, *it has been a grievous mistake not to have been followed to its ultimate conclusion. A hollow sphere consisting of both mass and negative electric charge; in itself held together in some manner, while as a whole centered on and surrounding the nucleus.* In this conception, (a) the exact disposition of mass and charge in the space within the spherical shell constitutes the internal structure of the electron itself, while (b) the exact disposition-and-motion of one or more electrons around the nucleus constitutes the mechanical structure of the atom. *Without question*, the interaction between nucleus and electron(s) *must* affect their separate internal structures but to a *lesser* degree; while *most* of their interaction *must* relate to the structure of the atom *as a whole*. As Bohr's original theory and what was later built on it related to the atom as a whole, I too limited myself to it. The internal structure of the electron and the nucleus is still nowhere near being resolved. It is important to note that *it had already been realized early on* that if such a spherical shell rotates, the tiny rotating charges will form circular currents, and they in turn will cause a magnetic field surrounding the sphere; together producing an electromagnetic moment *half as great* as the moment produced by a charge equal in size to the total electronic charge revolving in an orbit of equal diameter! Clearly, while this accounts for the *half spin* quantum numbers and does so in a *fully classical* manner, in the now standing theory, such numbers do *not* have a *clear* corresponding physical picture! It is inevitable then to conclude that, what had been missed early on was the *manner* in which the electronic sphere *vibrated* around the nucleus; vibration being the *only* mode of spherically symmetrical motion about a center!

If we imagine the electron as an elastic spherical spring harmonically vi-

brating under force F , but *never* collapsing down toward the nucleus, first off, the problem thought to exist of the *failure* of the electron to fall onto the nucleus and release its potential electrostatic energy as required by the classical conception *is automatically resolved by fully classical means!* But second off, because the Coulomb electrostatic F_c (or the lesser gravitational) force of the nucleus *cannot* be ignored, a *balancing* force F_b (incorporating the gravitational) *must* be regarded to exist such that

$$F + F_c + F_b = 0,$$

where

$$F = k \cdot |r - r_o|,$$

$$F_c = -Ze^2r^{-2},$$

r is the instantaneous radius of the electron, r_o its average (“equilibrium”) radius, k the elastic constant, e the unit electrical charge and Z the number of protons in the nucleus of a hydrogen-like atom. This scheme *frees the chemical atom of internal sources of tension, yet, keeps it subject as a whole to both external forces (including both perturbing forces at close range and the gravitational forces of all external bodies) and the force-free cosmological expansion as it applies to it!* Under this scheme, *no force, whether internal or external*, remains unaccounted for, while the idea of the atom as a *stable wholesome unit is fully assured*, except as its stability *must* be affected by the cosmological expansion. The clear superiority of this scheme over the Bohr *and* current conception, *both* of which consider as operating *only* the Coulomb force is already evident!

That the above zero sum of forces truly applies may at first be questioned; specifically as nothing precise can at present be said of the nature and source of the balancing force, except that, first, in the study of the electron as a harmonic oscillator within the atom, knowledge of its mathematical expression is *not* needed as it suffices that it equals $-(F + F_c)$, while second, the operation of the electron as a harmonic oscillator *cannot truly leave unaffected the nucleus, that must respond in a counterbalancing oscillation!* While this latter question must remain for the future, *all doubts regarding the above scheme are removed* by the success of its application to the electron.

Without doubt, all these, relating closely to the *sphericity* of the chemical atom, *are most important characteristics* not only of the atom as a whole, but also of the vibrating electron and nucleus; *bearing on their structure too, bridging the superatomic and subatomic structure of matter; and making a unity of the two and indeed of the whole physical world!* Yet, *they so far have been ignored!* The now accepted quantum theory *has failed to consider the full implications of all our observations!* Our ordinary observations, begun to get scientifically organized with the development of modern chemistry, point to the *unquestionable fact* that nature reserves for the chemical atom the bridging position between the subatomic and superatomic components of matter. Our cosmo-

logical observations point to *another equally unquestionable fact, but one that has yet to be learned*: We did not, as we ought to have done, rush back to redraw the quantum theory on learning that the universe *expanded from zero volume and was once smaller than the present atoms*; which cannot have left unaffected even the atomic and subatomic matter! *There has been one of these two options*: either the micro-world always did and does participate in the universal expansion *under the very same laws as does the macro-world*; or else, *additional universal laws have decided* (a) the dimensions of the components of the micro-world, (b) the time of their fixing *if they ever were fixed*, and (c) how they participate differently in the universal expansion *if they do so*! There can be *no* question as to which option is preferable under Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity! *All this has so far been ignored*! All reference to the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity under the now accepted theories has been *so loose as to reveal our total failure* to appreciate its commanding position over what we ought to be thinking about the world!

Upon these basic ideas, step by impeccable step, the *full resolution* of the structure of the atoms made up of a nucleus surrounded onion-like by *concentric* electrons is obtained. The *approximate* model of the electron as a full vibrating sphere was developed first. This model was then modified to contain the electronic mass and charge in a vibrating spherical shell. The addition of extra electrons to build multi-electron atoms was then negotiated. As the detailed development of the ideas cannot be included here, permit me to state only the findings. In keeping with observed facts:

- (i) The Balmer law was reproduced!
- (ii) The Rydberg constant was reproduced!
- (iii) The wave number was reproduced!

(iv) The Planck “constant” h of action *was not introduced arbitrarily*, as in the Bohr and current theories, but *naturally*, following the recognition that *the rate of change of the polar moment of inertia of the oscillator has the physical dimensions of action*!

(v) The amount of action involved *was not assumed* to come only in whole units of h . Rather, the action involved was introduced as the quantity nh , where n was taken to be *some but not necessarily whole* number. That *n is indeed a whole number came directly from the spectra* that were reproduced *only for whole and sequential values of n* !

(vi) So, not only was action found to be a *natural* property of the oscillator; and not only was indeed the *same* least amount of action found involved in the harmonic motion of the electron as had been found by Planck in the black-body radiation and by Einstein in the photoelectric phenomenon. But *now unquestionably shown was the fact that that amount of least action comes in exact whole-number multiples directly from the physical-natural system of the world*,

not from arbitrary human assumption and invention! Nature itself is thus shown to obey an objective physical-natural law cognizant of the sequence of the cardinal numbers! In plain words, not only humans, but now in a certain sense, nature itself was shown to know arithmetic!

(vii) We do *not* have to renounce visualization of the electron and its operation in the atom as a *fully classical* harmonic spherical oscillator! Not only *are* the transitions from one stationary state to the next *smooth*, as *the amplitudes of oscillations of adjacent states overlap spatially*, but also the geometrical characteristics (such as average radius and thickness of shell) and the operational characteristics (such as the amplitude, frequency, period, velocity, polar moment of inertia, and energy of oscillation) of the electron *can be given in explicit numbers!*

(viii) The geometrical and operational characteristics of the oscillating electron combine to form an additional factor ξ^2 multiplying the already known expression of the energy at each state. The value of this factor at each state is unique. The values of this factor at adjacent states differ very little from each other. The values of this factor for all states are very nearly one for hydrogen, one half for helium, one third for lithium, and so on!

(ix) The energy at each state *is positive*. This has the effect to *reverse and correct* the picture we have of the atom. As energy is added, the electron in the atom *pulls together and becomes geometrically smaller*. And ionization does *not* obtain from an infinite radius, but from a radius very close to that of the so-called ground state. This *resolves* the quandary the Bohr and current theories *chose to ignore discussing* of the atom increasing in size and progressively engulfing the world as the electron takes more energy and progresses towards ionization! And the resolution *is compatible* with the general picture we obtain of the entire world, having more energy when it was smaller and gradually losing energy as it expands to an infinite radius, at which there shall be no gravitational or other force left to cause it to return from!

Besides the picture of the hydrogen atom, *characteristically clear is also* the picture we obtain of the configuration of electrons in the other atoms; *contrary to the insistent statements* of quantum mechanicians that such picture “is” impossible!: It indeed is impossible, but only when it is attempted to be obtained based on the current theory! Therefore, *the fact alone that as is now proven nature allows a clear and classical picture to be had suffices to deliver the death blow to the current theory, despite its great successes!* It was found that:

- (i) The electrons are arranged in atoms onion-like!
- (ii) The electrons vibrate in tune!
- (iii) Each electron has *one* quantum number!
- (iv) The energy levels producing the spectral lines are *not* those of single electrons but of the *entire ensemble* of electrons!
- (v) An additional factor $(1 + q_1/n + q_2/n + \dots)$ containing the quantum numbers

of the electrons of the ensemble multiplies the energy expression obtained for the hydrogen atom. Here n is the quantum number of the first electron (as is the case of the hydrogen atom), q_1 is the quantum number of the second electron (as is the case of the helium atom), q_2 is the quantum number of the third electron (as is the case of the lithium atom), and so on!

(vi) At energy levels far from ionization, the quantum numbers of electrons are equal, meaning that the electrons have equal energies. But also meaning that as ξ^2 takes on values $1/2$, $1/3$, etc. for helium, lithium, etc., the product $(1 + q_1/n + q_2/n + \dots)\xi^2$ retains a value close to unity for all electrons in all atoms at energy levels away from ionization!

(vii) As the energy increases towards ionization, it is unquestionably the *inside* electron that takes on the higher quantum number and acquires the more energy!

(viii) At ionization, the total energy of the ensemble divides between the ionizing electron and the *remaining* ensemble, the energy of which fits *exactly* the resulting configuration of quantum numbers and energy, as well as provides a *seamless* transition from the neutral atom to the first ion, to the second ion, and so on!

(ix) As the onion-like arrangement *is a single ordinal arrangement*, nature is shown to know how to place itself in order! As a result, the atomic energy-level diagrams are greatly simplified; and their haphazard picture obtained on the basis of the now accepted theory is gone!

I give here the findings in detail with *the additional statement that absolutely nothing was adjusted in order to obtain them* [just remember Hylleraas!], in order to show *clearly even to those remotely familiar* with the claims of the now accepted theory *how vastly superior* to it Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity makes the order of nature! Because, *it now becomes scientifically incontrovertible* that to the extent the picture of nature here revealed is imperfect, *its true picture can only be even more ordered than is here revealed, and not less ordered* as per the now accepted theory! What this makes of the now accepted theory, vehemently denying the so-called “hidden variables”, and of *all* efforts to obtain an “equation of everything” based on no better than the now accepted theory is also all too clear! As is the value of the belief in the *supposedly intrinsic* uncertainty of nature, *here shown to be totally false*! Uncertainty remains *only as it relates to prediction of some specific result* in terms of direction and velocity of particles flying off after an atomic (or subatomic) collision, hereby seen to result from the *oscillatory nature* of the electron (or nucleus)! Just try billiards with *vibrating balls bouncing off the vibrating balls of equal size making up the walls* of the pool table! But just as before, when the uncertainty in games of chance was shown to result from the *underlying laws of the construction* of such as dice and decks, so too now, the un-

certainty of *prediction* is shown to result from the *totally incontrovertible underlying laws of the structure of the atom*! Uncertainty remains within bounds exactly as a result of *those* laws determining *both* the size of the unit *h* of action *and* the sizes, amplitudes, frequencies, and vibratory velocities of the colliding particles, that *cannot but fly off with transitional velocities and in directions dependent* on the sizes, amplitudes, frequencies, and vibratory velocities of the colliding particles *at the exact moment of collision*!

If all these, made in addition to my earlier statements regarding energy, gravitation, relativity, and the Michelson-Morley experiment, surprise you, you surely will *not* be less surprised to learn that the scientific establishment *has been duly notified of them, too, since 1985*, has *not* refuted them, has *refused* to admit their existence, has *suppressed* them, and has *continued to teach the now all too clear falsehoods of the still accepted theories* to trusting students paying them *good* money, *whom they thus miseducate and corrupt in no ordinary measure*! The accusation *is indeed heavy*! But it is *not* leveled by me! Only by the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity; that *may not and does not* mince words!

If, as you mentioned in your book and I discussed earlier, the scientists had *good* reasons to be preoccupied with God, just imagine what happens in their souls since 1985! It is *there* that the battle of Good and evil rages wilder than has ever raged in human souls! You ended your book saying that “Truth also seeks us”. Here *is another aspect of Truth that also seeks to liberate us*! But that *they* choose to *keep from* the public! That *they surely never mentioned* in your discussions and interviews with them! Most certainly, then, *not* in order to make us free!

Because the public, on learning of the underlying laws, *shall demand to know of their source*! Which, however, our pseudo-agnostic and atheist friends, *all of them vehemently practicing anti-Theists*, are *not* willing to reveal! Because, *what* can they say? That the underlying laws are of the making of the *physical* universe? But have they not all along *refused* to recognize *any* mentality, and so also *any and all* law-making ability, to the universe, in effect recognizing *only themselves as the sole proven to exist* scientific conscience and consciousness of the universe? Other than their own brains, consciousness and conscience, the universe out there, as we have already discussed but *is* worth repeating, *cannot* be shown to possess a central law-making establishment or law-emanating and report-receiving mechanism *as are indispensable if* the underlying laws are from *this* universe! And they *have surely missed* the existence of what is here discussed! *What other* can they say, then, regarding the source of the *indisputably existing* underlying laws? That it is a “mystery”? Call it a “mystery”! Or call it what you will! Have we humans not given the name of *Law-giver*, and *Maker*, and *Creator*, and *Logos*, and *A kai Ω*, to *exactly that* “mystery”? If, then, the

irrefutable existence of the underlying *physical-natural* laws, here revealed in all their glory lying in the *irrefutable numerical* results of our *scientific experiments*, makes the existence of that “mystery” *equally irrefutable*, *how exactly* does that differ from the *equally irrefutable proof* of the *existence* of God, *Law-giver, Maker, Creator, Logos*, and *A kai Ω*? Is it not an *ipso facto negation* of its “mysteriousness” to reveal a thing *in all its glory*? How much “mystery” remains in Him, then, *now that He is thus revealed scientifically in all His glory*? For very long, people have sought *proof irrefutable* of His existence! Now, that proof *is given them scientifically*! In *what other logical* form, could one think, the *scientific proof* of the existence of God could possibly come? It is the compelling nature of the *obvious* answers to all these questions that the scientific establishment of our times *cannot* avoid facing, except by puerile denial! Is it not thus also shown that geniuses *can* be puerile? Is it not thus also shown that geniusness is *not* the same as wisdom? And is it not *also known, if only to the wise*, that you *cannot* make vanish what you puerily deny?

H. THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION

This is the last modern theory remaining to be discussed in the present context. Its development and traditional discussion have taken place *independently of the underlying issues of chemistry and physics*! Indeed, *all* great scientific theories so far have been developed *in isolation* from the surrounding *great balance* of physical *and* logical constraints that bear *naturally* on them! It is only later that the theories are “adjusted”, or rather *manhandled*, to “fit” the requirements of the real world! *So* it has been with the theories of continuum, that were built ignoring the *fact that real things are cut up and there is a natural limit to the process of division*! *So* it has been with the theories of *atomic* matter, that were built ignoring the *fact that there is indeed a uni-verse out there to the laws of which they too must comply*! And *so too* it has been with the theory of evolution, *that has ignored more problems than any other theory*! The *uni-verse and its parts* has yet to be seen as a whole that ignores *no fact and no “detail”*! For us to continue along that “time-honored” venue *would be* patently irresponsible! Rather, we should first try to see what has truly transpired around that theory and then return to see the development of the living species *as a unity with the underlying physical problem*! For having reached so far in this discussion, *this much must already be clear to us*: As the underlying physical problem has *already proved the existence of God*, to continue believing that the theory of natural selection can still dispel the need of God is as responsible as believing that an 80th-floor penthouse can on its own dispel the need of the structure below on which it is built!

Even about this theory too, there has been sufficient damaging confusion! For one thing, Charles Darwin himself did *not* discuss the *deeper* causes of evo-

lution! He did *not* say that it was, or was not, from God! He did *not* have the scientific support needed to make a *definitive* statement of that sort. It seems to me that, all that is said about his *true* beliefs on this matter can be *only* conjectural. But, I admit, I have *not studied* his biography! But coming when it came *without* a statement of that sort, the theory could not but *create* a furor! Even today, *there remains uncomprehended the vast logical difference* between special and general creation, on the one hand; and between an *unspecified* general creation and a *specific* general creation *designed and devised from the beginning such that it produce exactly all and nothing less or more than were conceived to be produced, when it would be logically possible and good for them to be produced into being*, on the other!

At the time the theory appeared, the *special creation by species* was the *only* mode of creation conceivable. It still is today in most people's minds. *It* certainly was the kind of creation *first* implied by the Book of Genesis in the minds of simple people of all ages and times unfamiliar with the *deep logical* problems involved in Creation! But consider: For one thing, the Hebrews were *not* a scientific people and what they thought, *or was revealed to them in words they could then understand*, cannot be binding to the *very last word simplistically understood* over us all for the rest of time! Just as the language we use to talk to babies *is not* binding over the adult world! This has been *one* source of confusion.

For another thing, under the "parabolical and many interpretations" theory of the Bible, what is *first* implied *does not exhaust all that is* implied or *was meant by God to be well understood by all people of all ages and times* depending on the level of their *advancing* understanding of the logical issues involved in Creation. What is binding over God is what *He* did, not what *fallible* human minds "understand" and "interpret", and what *fallible* human hands write down on *corruptible* papyrus, that is later "restored" according to the "understanding" of the "restorer"! If it were possible to be observed by *anyone* of us standing then as a non-physical observer, the *specific* general creation detailed above *could not and would not* fail to be interpreted as *special creation by species*! God being *pure* Spirit, *as pure Spirit* did He create the world! He could *not* have materialized in the form of matter *not yet created* to create the world by hand! *Nor* would He later have appeared in material form during an essentially *inelegant* process, solely in order that from soil and His saliva He create *by hand* the living things and *us*! *All* specific items comprising the world *necessarily* appeared in time as products of *special creation by species*, even as *they were only designed from the beginning to appear in such times as were specified for each and built in the universal equations of Design of the Specific General Creation*! *To this very day*, not even the "specialist" scientists *understand* this cardinal point! And if they object with a "how do you know?", I *will* suggest

that they *forget* Plato's *binding* principle-challenge that *everyone is free* to offer, *if he can*, a *more* reasonable understanding of things! This has been *another* source of confusion.

For yet *another* thing, we *must* consider how people *divide* over this important issue: When the theory of evolution appeared, on the side of religious belief there stood only the option of *special creation by species*; while on the side of irreligious belief, there stood the *only* other option *then or ever* thought possible, namely, that of "*creation*" by *pure chance*; "chance" being the *only* kind of "creative" agent that is possible to imagine at all in the absence of God! As a result, on the irreligious and *supposedly* "scientific" side, there stood people who objected to the belief in God for whatever *other* reason; while with them there *also* stood otherwise bona fide reasonable people who thought opposition to that belief their "only logical" option, *without in the least comprehending the tremendous logical problems* this their chosen option introduces, that are revealed when this their option is examined closely! While on the religious and *supposedly* "obscurantist" side, there stood people believing themselves bona fide faithful Christians in thinking of the *traditional special creation by species* as their only *con Deo* option without in the least comprehending the *grave compromises* this makes to their belief as Christians in an *All-wise* God; while with them there *also* stood *all* remaining people, who though not specifically religious *by consciousness*, nevertheless found it *both intellectually and morally abhorrent to believe in the possibility even* of creation by pure chance! This has been *yet another* source of confusion.

In the great general confusion resulting from these three sources, people other than disciplined scientists and philosophers were and are more excused to take the specific stance they took or still take. Scientists and philosophers were and are *far less* excused, while the disciplined ones among them were and are excused not at all; specifically the ones that became and become *advocates without objective proof* of their position and *without* taking as *possible* the *worst possible opposite* case against *which* they ought to design their own case, but instead sought and still seek to "defend" their choice of camp by *casuistry even elaborately hidden*, and *willful connivance at it*, that is infinitely more detestable when done in the name of "reason" or "science"! In light of the above and what still follows, R. Dawkins' attack against Creation by Design is seen to fall squarely in the *worst possible category of casuistry and connivance* brought against the *traditional special creation by species*; which *remains the only opponent* against which the evolutionists are willing to wage war, *pretending ignorance* of the wider issues of Creation!

What Dawkins overlooks, and makes it *particularly painful and sorrowful* to watch a *supposedly* disciplined scientist do, is *his intellectual dishonesty* he *himself exposes*! What in effect he argues for is the particular theory of "punctu-

ated equilibrium” within the theoretical scheme of evolution by natural selection. The first problem is that neither he nor any other evolutionist has managed to produce a *reasonable physical cause* for the *supposed* “fact” that evolution advances by locking in on the *next higher* organism it produces at a time. The *only* mechanism *all evolutionists accept without demur* is that of *blind and purposeless* mutation. Why should the mechanism of mutation lock an organism in on a particular structure, *if there is no preferred direction and ordering* of structures? *Not* blind and purposeless? Then *somebody sees through and purposes!* Preferred direction and ordering of structures? *Who* prefers and orders? *No* preferring and ordering? *Why* is there *only* evolution and *no devolution*? If chance rules, in the long *and all too visible* run, evolution *and* devolution ought to come in *roughly equal* amounts! Locking in? What is *it* that locks an organism in on a structure? Need? Surely not! The deaf, hearing *not* and having *no idea* of hearing, *have no need of hearing!* The “need” to hear is *appended* on the hearing-not by those who *already* hear and feel that *everybody* is “better off” hearing! When nobody hearing is around, even this appending *cannot* be done! But there are dangers out there that the organism must defend itself against by developing the equipment of hearing? *How* does it know that hearing, *of which it has no sense yet*, can defend it against *some* dangers, *the presence of which it cannot sense yet*, having *no sensory equipment*? Not the organism but the *process* knows? *How* does the *process* know what is needed? To see what this means, try reading this last sentence thinking of *each one* emphasized item at a time! It (organism or process) does not know? Then *who* does? *No* locking in? *Why* any two of us look very much the same? In a blind and purposeless process *no purposive instrument or mechanism of any kind, obvious or hidden*, is allowed! Any motion in such a system *must of necessity be chaotic, not organizing, nor self-organizing!* In such a system, not even “needs” exist, let alone *needs!* “Needs” that *are thought to exist by outsiders* to the system! “Needs” that *can be gotten and can be lost!* In such a system, there is *no* telling what *need* is! *Before there can be need*, there *must be purpose* to which *need* tunes; homing in to which, the *need* makes itself sensed by the *needy!* The evolutionists have *reversed* this natural order! They *assume* there are needy, even when there is no need felt because there is no conception of purpose! And then they insist that instruments develop helpful in “guiding” to *no purpose at all!* It has been, *it always is, scientifically irresponsible* to call a theory scientifically well founded when it *cannot* answer *fundamental* questions that bear *crucially* on its subject-matter! This is the case of the theory of evolution *as presented!*

Then mutations *are supposed* to be *mild and benign mistakes* that carry the process *only forward!* In a blind and purposeless process, *why or how* are mutations carrying *only forward?* Forward and backward? Why do the evolutionists *refuse* to produce the statistics of *successful and unsuccessful blind and pur-*

poseless “attempts”? Now first, would *you* call it an “attempt”, if there were *no* prior knowledge of *objective*, that one *reaches by attempting to reach it knowing it is there*? Then again, *where is all the litter of the failed “attempts”?* Relative to the *few* successes, the number of awful failures *must be* in the zillions! In a blind and purposeless process, the fossil record *must of necessity be the record of failures, not of successes*! Is it then upon the record of *failures* that evolution has built its *supposedly successful* advancement? To carry the evolutionary process forward, it is *not enough* that an organism be just viable, *it must be contributive* to the process! On mutating, a *perfect* organism *can only result in a less perfect* organism! *How* then is the process carried from perfection to perfection *through imperfection*? And *where are all those linking imperfections*? Then again, a *less than perfect* and *not by its purpose spirited* organism, mutating, *cannot be trusted* to carry the process to its “objective”, that unless it is *objective*, the process would *never* be known as *evolution*, but rather as *total mess and chaos*, that *could never have brought us here whether as individuals or society capable of debating it*! A *less than perfect* mutant to see the process through? Would *you* mount an *untrained workhorse* to see *you* through the Olympic equestrian course? Are the evolutionists so blind that they do *not* see around? Or is it that they do see, all right, but they do *not understand* what they see? *Where are the zillions of teratogenic forms, both living and dead*, a blind and purposeless process *of necessity must* produce? There is simply *no end of reasonable questions* that the theory of evolution *fails* to answer! If faced with this large number of questions on the one side and the *deafening silence* on the other, our cynic remarks that there is no science here, but only a *lower form of religion dressed as “science”*, what will the evolutionists say to him? What will it take for them to realize that even the term “evolution” *is a misnomer* for a blind and purposeless process? Now, *apply* the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity to the question of evolution. That the theory of evolution possesses no mathematical-physical body does *not* make it immune to the test of this Principle! After all, even mathematics *is part of Logic*! Make a list of all questions as the above. Opposite that list, in a second column, posit *one self-consistent* mechanism, process or idea, that when applied you think resolves the questions. In a third column and against each question, write down how the *one* item in the second column answers the question. Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity *has the unique advantage that it answers all questions with absolute clarity and confidence*! Against that measure, now judge the results! If *all other* items, one at a time, that you try in the second column fail, you are *not* an objective scientist if you do not then write down the name of God! *He is the only carrier* of the Logic the evolutionary process *needs* in order to succeed! But the evolutionists are trying to use the evolutionary process as a *replacement* of God, as a *weapon against Him, who is pivotal to the process and alone assures* its success! Now, the boomerang returns home!

Now consider the phrase “methinks it is like a weasel” Dawkins picked from Shakespeare’s complete works. It is intellectually, not to add morally also, dishonest to try to build a *supposedly* “scientific” case on just this 6-word 28-letter sequence! If you consider this statement “socially or politically incorrect”, the following will convince you of its truth!: The example of this phrase may perhaps be valuable (which *must* be doubted) as an example of how the process of selection “works”, *given from the beginning*, as you too indicate, *the clear final objective* the computing-searching process *was designed to look for, every time locking in* on a construct that was statistically (even remotely) closer to the *final yet preconceived* objective, and *in no time reversing course* towards a statistically less likely finding! For this *thus specifically doctored* search for the 6 correct words in a 28-letter sequence, it took 43 *thus punctuated* “generations”! Question: How many “generations” would it have taken to produce Shakespeare’s *complete* works? Now, I am no Shakespeare expert. Based on my copy of his works, I just estimated them, very roughly, to consist of *about* 834000 words and 6006000 letters. Should I say, based on this count, that it would have taken about $(834,000/6) \times 43 = 5,977,000$ generations calculated by word count, or $(6,006,000/28) \times 43 = 9,223,500$ generations calculated by letter count? I, trying to be a *disciplined* thinker and *not* to misguide my reader (and *far less* my student!), would *not* risk my reputation, and *far less my self-respect*, with *such a simplistic* statement! Rather, I would produce, based on *experiments* conducted with the computer, a *realistic* graph of generations required to produce the *required* result as a *function of word and letter count*! I do *not* doubt it that the function *is* exponential! A mere arithmetic extrapolation *lacking any sort of confidence is*, to my mind, *worthless* ! How “scientifically” worthy the “improvement” truly is of the *doctored* computer program over the monkeys as an “argument” of “showing” how “selection without design” “has worked” in *real* life is now becoming apparent! Even if the program took, say, *half* an hour to produce Dawkins’ result, by an arithmetic extrapolation, it would have taken the computer about 8 and 12 years respectively to produce the result of Shakespeare’s complete works! A second-hand car salesman will impress *only the impressionable* with the *seemingly comforting* statement that it took his computer “less than an hour” to come up with the right result (in his puerile example; which he won’t mention)! Do we realize that a ten times faster computer would still need about 10 to 15 months to produce the right result in the case of Shakespeare’s complete works? A *fast* computer taking 10 to 15 months? A *much less rosy* picture, a second-hand car salesman would *not* use! How does even that translate in *real* life? Do we realize that even only 6 million and 9 million generations at 25 years per generation amount to 150 million and 225 million years respectively, i.e., *much* longer than men and monkeys took together, taking us back to the *Jurassic and late Carboniferous* periods of geological time? That even cutting

that time by a factor of 2.5 (assuming an average generation per only 10 years) would still take men and monkeys 60 and 90 million years respectively, still much too long? Now, factor in the *exponential* effect! And now, factor in the *additional fact* that Dawkins' "generations" are *not* ordinary generations (and his use of the term is *gratuitous and bound, even if not chosen, to mislead* when its difference from a usual generation is *not* clearly stated)! Dawkins' "generation" is a generation of a *mutant* that, in your own words, "happen[s] to be just a hair's breadth closer to the goal phrase than its brothers and sisters"! This is *not* the same as an *ordinary* generation! *Ordinary* generations are *not* mutant generations! Mutant generations *are much much rarer than, and each of them contains many many, ordinary* generations! So, the process *can only have taken correspondingly that much longer* than calculated even with the exponential effect factored in! It is *not* intellectually honest to say *only* what one's pet theory "explains"! One must *also* say what it means in *real* life, and *what percentage of the whole out there* it represents! **If that is not done, laicizers of science and its associated problems, trusting the "experts", are only the first victims! But through them, the general public is surely misled to believe naked falsehoods!**

And now finally, in addition to the above, consider that as the *complete* works of Shakespeare *are themselves dwarfed* letter for chemical atom even by the amoeba, *so is* the number of combinations available to them dwarfed by the number of combinations available to the chemical atoms of the amoeba, *if* the latter are packed lawlessly! How many "generations" *without a preconceived end result to aim at*, and how many *real* generations, would it have taken to obtain the smallest living organism out of the immediately lower state of being? Not even by their own desperately concocted "arguments" and examples, when closely examined, are the evolutionists saved from embarrassment!

But what is far more embarrassing is the *fact* that the evolutionists *and* Dawkins *ignore* that, as scientists, they are *duty and honor bound to think things through to, or from, the deepest possible level* from which their scheme could possibly have developed! Can Dawkins produce an *equal* "feat" of dove from hat in respect of the *vastly more unlikely* probabilities of producing *out of nothing at all* the *specific laws demonstrated above* that *control* our universe? I.e., *not just as mere mathematical entities, but also as factual operative laws out there*, as they are needed *to control our universe*? Both under the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity? It is *obvious* that even the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity itself *cannot* exist without *all laws needed and as needed even for it to exist being there; without even one missing or being in excess, and without even one being other than it truly is!* But leave that deepest level of laws! Take an example from the *visible* level of laws! Take Newton's law of gravitation! See that it belongs in the category of $F = GMmr^x$,

where x can have *any value at all, not only whole but also fractional, not only negative but also positive!* To *each* value of x a *separate universe* corresponds! A *true infinity* of universes! How each of them would be or look need *not* concern us! *Only* to the *exact* value of 2 [why *only* to it *cannot* be dealt with here] does *this complete* universe correspond! *Before* anything at all existed, and *without* God existing, how does Dawkins and Company think *that category of law and that exact value of 2* were chosen? And by *whom*? As we have seen, the physical-natural laws are *not* properties of matter, but *what holds matter together that makes it have the properties we observe it has!* Matter, this *entire universe* of matter, Newton's G , time, and law, has *not* always existed! Before Hubble, people were excused to think otherwise. *No longer!* Dawkins and *all* like-minded people are *not* excused when they *still choose to remain willfully "unsuspecting"* of the effect of that *cardinal fact* upon their "theory of evolution by natural selection", that *is worthless unless it is complete right from the start*, right from the *zero instant* of the Big Bang! Within *zero time* did the world come into physical-natural being, matter *and* the laws it obeys, that make it have the properties it has! Is Dawkins willing to play his entire game of combinatorics in *zero time*? Calculation shows that there exist out there about 5.891×10^{120} fundamental particles/photons, but an *exact* number! *Why and how that exact number?* I *cannot* help regarding *any* scientist dealing in fundamentals *not a serious scientist when he chooses to remain "unsuspecting" of the cardinal fundamentals!* Again, please note that it is not *I* that cannot help thinking so! Rather, it is the Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity that *cannot help making me think* in these terms! A demanding mistress? A *compelling* mistress! Goddess Athena (= Α Θεοῦ Νόησις, that is God's Faculty of Mind and Faultless Reasoning *emphasized*), *no less*, in *Holy Person!*

So, what is the *very worst* case that believers *and* non-believers, we all, are *compelled* to think of? Special creation by species means that God after creating each species started all over again to create the next one, from soil and His saliva! Which He then had to make *fit* in the world! And then all over again! But we are *not* talking of a tailor here, making suits to fit! Nor does God make species and individual organisms in series, fitting them one at a time, like a tailor fitting suits in series, one at a time! However much such individual God's-time-consuming attention would satisfy our micronoiac arrogance: "Hey look, God is fitting *me* now!" Such production is *not* economical in the highest possible sense of the term, nor particularly, if at all, wise! Wise producers do *not* produce a substratum of existence and only then see what, if anything, fits! Truly wise producers *see through the whole set of considerations necessary to their final objective* and make *that whole* fit together right from the beginning! We do *not* make our *best science* when we think of the Creator and His creation *even in slightly lesser* terms! To make a long story short, the very worst case then is

that *each individual organism (belonging in a species) that ever existed, exists, will exist, was made to fit an exact, unique to it, particular, numerical solution of an exact, unique, particular quantum mechanical equation (in the newest sense indicated earlier); one such equation per species and particular to it; all considered from the beginning in the form each was designed to take, commensurate with the function each was designed to play, when each was needed to perform that function, while a clock would be marking out the time each would come into being, in the most God-economical manner, out of preexisting organisms, and the simplest of them out of preexisting inorganic matter, and it out of the Big Bang, when all was set to go in space and time, as it had been pre-designed to develop towards its final objective!* If this sounds simply fantastic in the extreme, why should it do so any longer when science discovers that *out even of a tiny bit of tissue a whole organism can be reconstructed?* What other does this demonstrate than the *fact that even each piece of tissue belongs in a specific quantum solution of matter arranged according to Design, within which solution even that bit of tissue finds finally its resting place?* Does Dawkins and *all like-him-minded* people still object to Design? Without *such an exact sort of Design*, how do *they* propose the bit of tissue *reproduces the whole organism, and finds its place within the whole?* With Schiller and Beethoven, one is tempted to cry out loud

“For God’s sake,
for Truth’s sake,
for *our own* sake,
O Freunde, *nicht mehr* diese Töne!”

Does it sound fantastic that there are exact quantum-mechanical solutions out there of such complexity as to be endowed with self-and-environment-awareness as to ask the *ultimate questions about the exact Nature of Being?* They have rejected the idea of the independent existence of the Spirit apart from matter! And now look: Even as they deny the Spirit in us, in themselves, in you, in me, their own, and your own, and my own Spirit; it is *matter, their* materialist matter, *no other than the rocks themselves that rise up to hit them on the head and speak to them*, that endowed with self-and-environment-awareness asks the Great Questions! And the answers it gets point to the *Truth of God alone, pure Spirit alone, alone being there in/by His own exclusive right!* While we, *all the rest, down to the fundamental photon*, exist *only by His Grace!* Created self-and-environment-awareness, finally advancing to the level of being able to *consider and judge even the purely spiritual fundamentals of Being*, and to home in to the Creator Spirit that made it! *Who is anyone else* who judges *his* the temerarious right to demand that *He* not be written as *the only He*, but simply as another mere “he”; or else, *he*, ill-bred brat, will *not, not, not*, give *his* permission for your book to be published? What exactly do the atheists think they are, material-

ly, other than *just such* a solution? Is it then that the *only* thing they, we, the dirt of this earth, still deny is *their, our own, Designer*, cursing the Father who brought us here, but *not* in order that He may be cursed by; when *they*, the stars above and the photons everywhere *only sing His praises and only breathe His Fire*? For one last time, *how else* without Him did all that is come into being? Can the atheists of *all hues*, coming even under the cloak of *a sheep's infinite kindness that is not*, tell us; dispelling *all* crushing arguments here presented, the heavy accusations, this last charge of dastardly blasphemy? Or will they continue with their puerile silence? When they visit another world (as when some of them did visit the Soviet Union even at the peak of the Cold War), does/did *anyone of them* think, on seeing the laboratories there, that *nobody* designed them, that they came into being all alone? How, then, without a far, far more exact Design did we, *all humans*, come here, each one *manly to present, argue and, if he can, protect and defend his explanation of all that is, and his doings* in the presence of all that is? *Even if we are nothing more, we are walking, talking, breathing quantum-mechanical solutions of a particular Design!* Can they disprove *it*, playing the God they most definitely are *not*? If they cannot, with Homer adapted to the new situation, one now is tempted to cry out loud

Ἔσσετ' αἴσιμον, κάλλιστον, νόστιμον ἡμᾶρ

ὅτ' ἂν ποτ' ὁλώλη Κύριος πᾶν ἱρήϊον ψεύδους!

(There shall be the inescapable best-ever day of homecoming
when the Lord will wish to destroy
every priesthood of falsehood!)

And here it is right upon us!

The Day of Accounting, folks, *is* upon us!

The long day of pseudoscientific lies *has* finally set!

Dear Mrs. Ferguson:

I cannot quite say that I kept my word to keep this letter brief! I *can* say that I made it the shortest I could, given all that I found necessary to include in the effort of showing that Truth *indeed presents no mystery as to whether the physical world points to its Creator!* I am certain you will agree that had the scientists you interviewed given you an *honest* review of the problems here presented, let alone their resolution here presented, you would have written the book *in a totally other light!* You will ask, "but can all this be true?". Let me ask you to consider whether *anyone* could produce *such consistent arguments and proofs* to the points here discussed in the *short* period of 12 years (between 1974 and 1985) *if the product of his efforts were false!* If Truth is with God, then falsehood is *not* with Him, but with the devil! How then do *you* propose that the devil would even *attempt tempting* someone to *prove the existence of God from within this world*, from which effort *he would only stand to lose?* No! I am *not*

claiming to be a superlative genius! If *I* could show all this, then a *great* number of people *could*—*if they attacked the problem with all due attention to detail!* I only found *what was already there!* I have *not invented* anything! This *is* the Truth! What you will do with it, I shall leave it to you! Perhaps you will let me know! As I am sending this letter c/o Bantam Books, London, for now, I only ask that you let me know it reached you! Wishing you all the best,

April 21, 1997.

Most sincerely,

AUTHOR'S NOTE: The text presented here differs somewhat from that sent to Mrs. Ferguson. The reason is that after sending the original, revisiting the computer file revealed that, at some points, the text did indeed need some rearrangement in order that the meaning come up as clearly as was possible to me to express at the time of revisiting. The above date shows the time the alterations were completed.

Re: REPLY OF MRS. FERGUSON

KITTY FERGUSON

c/o Department of Political Science, Rutgers University, Newark, NJ 07102, U.S.A.

Wednesday, May 7, 1997

George P. Stavropoulos
45 Sporadon Street
Athens 11361
Greece

Dear Mr. Stavropoulos,

Since it has taken such a long time to reach me, let me hasten to say that your letter arrived today. It went by way of an address where I lived last year in Oslo, Norway. Bantam is more than a little remiss about keeping their files up-to-date, though I have reminded them more than once. I'm grateful that the Norwegian postal system is so gracious about forwarding mail!

I shall want to give your letter much deeper consideration than I can today. After one quick overview I would say you have made an extremely strong and eloquent case. Only after more careful reading would I be able to say whether I agree with every argument. Let me say that the main reason that I didn't write a book more along the lines you suggest is that I do not have the in-depth, first-hand knowledge of science that you do. Mine is, you must recognize, a layman's view. The book you suggest is *yours* to write, not mine.

Though I don't mention it in my book, I do believe in God. However, that belief isn't based on scientific reasons (indeed it predates my interest in science) but rather on a clear awareness of the presence of God in my own life and the lives of others whose integrity and level-headedness I trust. I would have to say: If I am sane, there is a God.

I may get back to you in more detail and perhaps with some caveats when I've had the opportunity to read more carefully what you've written. I will certainly let you know if I quote you or paraphrase your well-constructed arguments—giving you full credit of course—in my own writing.

I do appreciate so very much your taking the time and trouble to write at such length, and for letting me know that my book was interesting to you.

Best wishes,

Kitty Ferguson

Re: ΠΕΡΙ ΤΑ ΔΕΟΝΤΑ ΕΝ ΕΛΛΑΔΙ ΓΕΝΕΣΘΑΙ

Κον Θ. Σκυλακάκη, Γεν. Δ/ντήν
Ε 21
'Αλωπεκίης 42, 'Αθήνας, 10676

31 Δεκεμβρίου 1997.

'Αγαπητέ Κύριε Σκυλακάκη:

Εὐχαριστῶ δι' ὅς' εἰς ἀπάντησιν προεκφρασθείσης (πρὸς τὴν ἀπαντῶσαν τηλεφωνικὰς κλήσεις κυρίαν) ἐπιθυμίας μου γνωριμίας τοῦ σκοποῦ τοῦ ὑφ' ὑμᾶς "Κέντρου Ανάπτυξη Ιδεῶν γιὰ τὴν Ελλάδα του 21ου Αἰῶνα" ἀπὸ 17ης Δεκεμβρίου εὐγενῶς μοῦ ἐπεστείλατ' ἔντυπα, ἅπερ ἀνέγνωσα μετὰ προσοχῆς· ἐφ' ὧν ἀντιπροσφέρω τὰς πιθανῶς χρησίμους ὑμῖν ἀκολουθούσας παρατηρήσεις, προκληθείσας μὲν ἐξ ὧν ἀπεστείλατέ μοι προϊούσας ὅμως δ' ἐκ προσωπικῆς πείρας, παιδείας, σκέψεως καὶ *ἐνδοθεν γνώσεως* τοῦ *πέραν τῆς Ἑλλάδος μείζονος* κόσμου, ὅπου ἐπὶ τριακονταετίαν διεβίωσα τὸ δεύτερον ἡμισυ τῆς ζωῆς μου.

Ἡ ἐπὶ δεκαετίας ἀναμφίβολος ὑποχώρησις τῶν ἐπὶ πολιτισμῷ ἀναγκαίων θεμελιακῶν ἀξιών καὶ ἀρετῶν οὐδόλως ἀποτελεῖ μοναδικότητα τούτου μόνου τοῦ τόπου! Μοναδικότης τούτου τοῦ τόπου ἐστὶν ἡ νῦν παρὰ πάντων ὁμολογουμένη (πλὴν ὑπὸ μόνων τῶν ἐπιτρεψάντων αὐτὴν καὶ τῶν δι' αὐτῆς προσκαίρως ὠφελουμένων) *πλήρης ἀνυπαρξία πάσης ἐμφανοῦς* τινὸς πέδης *ἀληθῶς δυναμένης πεδῆσαι τὴν ταχεῖαν* αὐτοῦ κατολίσθησιν ἐπ' αὐτὸ τὸ μηδέν! *Οὐχ ὑπερβάλλω!*: Σκεφθῆτε μόνην τὴν *ἐβδομαδιαίαν ἐκατόμβην* τῶν "ἐθνικῶν" καλουμένων ὁδῶν, ἐν αἷς τὸ ἔθνος *ἀσφαλῶς ἀφανίζεται*, ἀλλ' οὐδεὶς τῶν παντοειδῶν *πλὴν κατ' ἐλάχιστον ἡλιθίων ἐνώπιον τῆς διαρκοῦς αὐτῆς συμφορᾶς* "ἡγετῶν" αὐτοῦ συγκινεῖται εἰς *Λογικὴν* δρᾶσιν! *Τίνας* οὐσιώδους αἰτίας ἢ ἀδράνεια αὕτη ἐστὶ προϊόν;

'Αναμφιβόλως γιγνώσκετε (ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὑμεῖς φεῦ ὥς καὶ πάντες πεισματικῶς οἱ λοιποὶ τοῦ τόπου τούτου ἡγέται ὁμολογεῖτε) τὸ *μέγα μέγεθος* τῆς καθ' ἡμῶν διαφορᾶς μεταξὺ τῆς *μακράωνος πολιτισμικῆς παιδείας* τῆς "Δύσεως" (ἐδραιωθείσης μὲν *ἐκ νέου* κατὰ τὴν Ἀναγέννησιν ἐπὶ τῆς *ἀρχαίας ἐλληνικῆς* παιδευτικῆς παραδόσεως ἀλλὰ καὶ μὴ ἐγκαταλειψάσης τὰς κατὰ τὸν μεσαῖωνα καὶ τὴν ἀκολουθήσασαν Μεταρρύθμισιν *ἐπιπόνως καὶ αὐστηρῶς* ἐκεῖ καλλιεργηθείσας *ἀληθεῖς* χριστιανικὰς ἀρετάς, αἵτινες ὁμοῦ νῦν ἀποτελοῦσιν *ἀναπόσπαστον μέρος* τοῦ "δυτικοῦ" χαρακτήρος *οὐδόλως βεβαίως* διὰ τούτων ὑπονοουμένου *τελείου* ὥς ἔχει!) καὶ τῆς *πληρῶς ἐν Ἑλλάδι ἀνυπαρξίας* (ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου μεσαίωνος *ἀρξαμένης*) ὁμοίου ἢ ἀναλόγου *συνολικοῦ* παιδευτικοῦ τοῦ λαοῦ ὑποβάθρου! Ὡς ἐν τῇ "Δύ-

σει" ὥντως ὑπάρχουσιν αἱ κληθεῖσαι "σιωπηλαὶ χριστιανικαὶ πλειονότητες" αἱ διαπεπιστωμένως διὰ μόνης τῆς αὐτῶν ἐπικλήσεως ἐνεργοῦσαι κάνακα-
λουσ' ἐς τὴν πολιτικὴν καὶ λοιπὴν τάξιν τὰς ἐκεῖ ἀπ' αὐτῆς παρεκτρεπομέ-
νας κοινωνικὰς μειονότητας, ἀλλ' οὐδεμία φεῦ ὑπάρχει ἐδῶ τοιαύτη ἀνάλο-
γος πλειονότης, ἡ μὲν ἐκεῖ παρατηρουμένη ἀξιών κἀρετῶν ὑποχώρησις ὥν-
τως ἐστὶ πρόσκαιρος κάναστρέψιμος, ὡς ἐπανειλημμένως ἠρέθη κατὰ τὸν
μετὰ τὸν δεύτερον πόλεμον χρόνον· ἡ δ' ἐνταῦθα παρατηρουμένη, ὡς οὐδε-
μίαν κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον παλινδρόμησιν παρουσιάσασα, δικαίως ἄρα χρή
θεωρεῖσθαι μὴ ἐγγενῶς ἀφ' ἐαυτῆς ἀναστρέψιμος ὡς νῦν ἔχει!

Ἀδερῖτως ἄρ' οὖν ἀπὸ τούτου προκύπτει ὅτι ἄνευ ἐπιπονωτάτης καὶ
μακροχρονίου συνολικῆς παιδευτικῆς καὶ πολιτισμικῆς παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ
προσπαθείας, ἣν ὁμως καταβάλλειν νῦν οὗτος ἀρκεῖται σκοπίμως λόγῳ καὶ
ἔργῳ παροδηγούμενος (misdirected) ὑπὸ τῶν μηδενιστῶν κοινωνικῶν αὐτοῦ
"ὁδηγῶν" τῶν νῦν ἐχόντων τὸ πρόσταγμα τῆς πορείας αὐτοῦ, ματαία ἐστὶ
πᾶσα ἐλπίς βελτιώσεως τοῦ ἐθνικοῦ ἡμῶν βίου! Οὐχ ὑπερβάλλω!: Οὐκ ἔξε-
στι σοφοῖς καταπλήττεσθ' ὑπὸ τῶν κατὰ μόνην ἐπιπολὴν φαινομένων! Πέ-
ραν τῶν ἐνταῦθα αἰσchrῶς καὶ κακεκτύπως ὡς ἔτι καὶ καθ' ὑποκλοπὴν, πλήν
ἄνευ αἰδοῦς ἢ βαθείας κατανόησεως πάσης τῆς σημασίας αὐτῶν, ἀναπαρα-
γομένων ξένων προτύπων, τίνα ὁ γηγενὴς δύναται δεῖξαι ἄξια, λελογισμέ-
να, συνετὰ πολιτισμικὰ ἔργα πρωτογενῶς μετὰ τὸν πόλεμον ἐν Ἑλλάδι
παραχθέντα καὶ προστεθέντα ἐπὶ τῷ παγκοσμίῳ πολιτισμοῦ κεφαλαίῳ;
Πῶς οὐ κατασχύνονται διὰ τὴν τοιούτων ἀνυπαρξίαν οἱ ἤδη διατελέσαντες
καὶ νῦν ὄντες "ἡγέται" τούτου τοῦ τόπου, οὓς κυρίως αὕτη βαρύνει; Βαρὺν
λίαν κρίνετε τούτον τὸν λόγον; Ἀναλογίσθητε: Τί ἡμῶν αὐτῶν, οὗ γε τῶν
προγόνων ἡμῶν, ἴδιον, τίμιον, μοναδικόν, σύγχρονον, δικαίως ποιοῦν ὑπερη-
φάνους ἡμᾶς, ἡμεῖς οἱ ἐνταῦθα νῦν ζῶντες ἔχομεν παρουσιάσαι φίλῳ τινὶ
ξένῳ ἐπισκέπτῃ; Ἀλλ' ὡς ὁ πολὺς λαὸς ξένους προσωπικοὺς φίλους οὐκ ἔ-
χει, πῶς ἄρ' οἱ "ἡγέται" ἡμῶν λούουσι τὸ δεινὸν τοῦτο πρόβλημα; Πῶς οὐ-
δεὶς ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐ προσωπικῶς αὐτὸν κατασχύνουσαν ἠσθάνθη τὴν ἔλλειψιν
ταύτην; Πῶς ὁ λαὸς οὗτος ἔπαυσεν θεωρεῖν φίλους τοὺς ἐπισκέπτας τοῦ
τόπου, οὐδόλως κατασχυνόμενος πρὸ αὐτῶν ὡς καὶ πρὸ ἑαυτοῦ διὰ τὴν εἰ-
κόνα αὐτοῦ, ἣν τυφλοὶ μόνοι οὐ καθορῶσι; Πῶς δ' ἡ "πνευματικὴ ἡγεσία"
τοῦ τόπου οὐδέποτε διὰ ταύτην ἠνόχλησε τὸν λαὸν καὶ τοὺς "ἡγέτας" αὐ-
τοῦ, συνεπίζουσα καὶ ἐλέγχουσα; Πῶς οὖν αὕτη καθορᾷ τὸ ἑαυτῆς χρέος;
Πῶς δ' οὐδ' αὕτη ἀπέφυγεν ἀπολέσαι τό ποτε Μέτρον; Πῶς δ' ὁ νῦν "Ἑλλή-
νων" λαός, παρ' αὐτῆς ἐὰν καλῶς ὁδηγῇται, σπουδαία τάνούσια καὶ τάνοσια
θεωρεῖ;

Ἐκτιμῶ τὴν ὑμετέραν προσπάθειαν κατατείνουσιν εἰς τὸ "να γίνων
καὶ να μένουν [οἱ Ἕλληνες] σεβαστοὶ ... καὶ γιατί επιτυγχάνουν να προσφέ-
ρουν ἓνα μοναδικό τρόπο ζωῆς, που συνδυάζει τὴν οικονομικὴ ανεξαρτησία
με τὴν ἀπόλαυση τῆς ζωῆς καὶ με μιά ισχυρὴ πολιτιστικὴ ταυτότητα καὶ ε-
θνικὴ παρουσία"! Ἀλλ' οὐ δύναμι' ἰδεῖν πῶς ἄνευ πάντων τῶν ὡς ἂν ὁ σκο-
πὸς ἡμῶν ἐστὶν οὐ μόνον καθ' αὐτὸν ἄξιος τοῦ αἰωνίου ὀνόματος τῆς Ἑλλά-
δος ἀλλὰ καὶ προσεγγίσιμος ἀπὸ μόνης τῆς λίαν τετριμμένης, ὡς καθημε-
ρινῶς πλὴν κατ' ἀγνόησιν τοῦ παγκοσμίου προβλήματος νῦν αὕτη ἀσκέται,

ἐνασχολήσεως περὶ τὰ στενότατα *ταπεινά* κρατικά οἰκονομικά καὶ διοικητικά πλαίσια, *ἀθεμελιώτως ἐπὶ τὰ οὐσιώδη βάθρα τοῦ ὅλου πολιτισμοῦ*, οὗτινος τὸ οἰκονομικὸν καὶ διοικητικὸν μικρὸν μόνον μέρος τοῦ ὅλου ἐστίν, εἰς τὴν ὑπηρεσίαν τοῦ ὅλου σκοποῦν! Ὡς οὐδεὶς ἄνθρωπος ἢ λαὸς δικαιούται διὰ τῶν ἄθλων τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ διὰ *μόνων τῶν εὐγενῶν, τιμίων καὶ πᾶσι χρησίμων ἃ οὗτος ἐν τῷ συμπαρόντι χρόνῳ παράγει*, πῶς ἄρα ὁ τῶν νῦν "Ἑλλήνων" *μοναδικὸς ἀληθῶς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἄλλ' οὐδόλως τούτους τιμίων* τρόπος ζωῆς καὶ *μηδευιστικῆς* αὐτῆς "ἀπολαύσεως", κἂν πως οἰκονομικῶς βελτιούμενος, τὸν ἄνθρωπον τιμῶσαν ἐπὶ τῷ πολιτισμῷ προσθήκην συνίστησι; Μιμήσεως ἢ *ἀποφυγῆς* ἐστὶν ἄξιον τὸ ὑπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος νῦν παρεχόμενον προσωπικοῦ καὶ ἐθνικοῦ βίου ὑπόδειγμα; Ἀλλὰ περὶ τούτου, *οὐδὲν παρ' οὐδενὸς* λέγεται τῶν κατεχόντων δημόσιον βῆμα!

Ὡς ἐφ' ὑμῶν, αὐτονομασθέντων ὡς "Κέντρου Ἀναπτύξεως Ἰδεῶν", καταπίπτει ἡ κυρία εὐθύνη ἀναπτύξεως τῶν *στερρῶν* ἰδεῶν, *πάντων τῶν λοιπῶν "πνευματικῶν"* τῆς χώρας ὀργανισμῶν τυρβαζόντων περὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ καὶ κενά, οὐδόλως δὲ περὶ ἃ ὦν νῦν ἐστὶν ἀπόλυτος χρεία, *οὐδόλως ἐγὼ τᾶνωτέρω* πρὸς ἀποθάρρυνσιν ἀναφέρω, ἀλλὰ πρὸς *μόνην τὴν ὀρθοτέραν* *πλαισίωσιν* τοῦ ὅλου μεγάλου ὑμῶν ἐγχειρήματος! Τὰ οἰκονομικά τῆς χώρας προβλήματα, περὶ ὧν κυρίως φαίνεσθ' ἀμέσως ἐνδιαφερόμενοι, ζημιοῦντες ἐν τούτῳ τὴν ὑμετέραν εἰκόνα, *ἀσφαλέστερον συλλυθήσονται* ὅταν ἐπιλυθῶσι καὶ τὰ ὑποκείμενα προβλήματα τῆς ὅλης *παιδείας καξιοπρεπείας* (πλήν οὐχ ὡς αὐταὶ νῦν "συζητοῦνται"!) τοῦ ὅλου τῆς Ἑλλάδος λαοῦ, *ἐξαπατηθέντος ὑπ' ἀναισχύντων δημαγωγῶν πρὸς αἰσχρὰς ἀπολαύσεις, ὠνουμένας δι' ἀτέρμονος ἀσώτου πρὸς δουλείαν χρεώσεως* μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς *τιμίας καὶ συνετῆς* αὐτοῦ ἐργασίας, καὶ τοσοῦτον *καταβλακευθέντος* διὰ τῆς τοιαύτης ἀπυθμένου ἐξαχρειώσεως *ὥστε μηδέποτε περὶ ἀποχρεωστέσεως ἐρωτᾶν!* Ἐὰν διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν ἀπαιδευτῶν οὐδεμίαν χῦμεις τοῦ ὅλου προβλήματος μνείαν ποιήσητε τῷ λαῷ, *οὐδ' ὑμεῖς ἀσφαλῶς ἔξετ' ἐπιτυχίαν* τινὰ ἐν τῇ προσπαθείᾳ ὑμῶν! Ὅτι τοιαύτη ἐστὶ τῶν πραγμάτων ἡ φύσις! Ὡς δ' αὐτὰ νῦν ἔχουσι, ἄλλων τόπων ἤδη διδόντων τοῖς λαοῖς μάλα κάλλιον τοῦ τῆς παρούσης Ἑλλάδος ὑπόδειγμα βίου, ἐργασίας, εὐτυχίας, ἢ τιμίας ἀληθοῦς ἀπολαύσεως, *πᾶς λόγος τὴν ἄφευκτον ταύτην ἀλήθειαν ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ ἀποκρύπτων σαπρὸς ὅλος ἐστὶ καὶ ἐπίβουλος* τοῦ προσωπικοῦ καὶ ἐθνικοῦ αὐτοῦ μέλλοντος! Ὅτι ὡς *παντελῶς περιττεῖται τᾶσων τῆς παρούσης* Ἑλλάδος, μέγιστος νῦν ἐστὶν ὁ κίνδυνος (οὐπερ ἡ φοβερά πιθανότης *πολλαπλῶς* διαφαίνεται!) μήπως οἱ μὲν λαοί, ἀποθαρρυνόμενοι διὰ τὰς συνεχεῖς ἡμῶν κατ' αὐτῶν ὕβρεις καὶ τὴν γενικὴν ἡμῶν ἀσωτείαν, ἀποβάλλωσιν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκογενείας αὐτῶν, ἡμεῖς δ' αἰεὶ ἄσωτοι κἀδιώρθωτοι δικαίως ἐμπέσωμεν *ὡς καὶ πρότερον* ταῖς χερσὶ τῶν ἀσπόνδων τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐχθρῶν! Ὡσθ' ἡ ὀρθὴ λύσις ὅλων οὐ δὲ μόνων τῶν οἰκονομικῶν προβλημάτων τῆς χώρας ἐστὶν ὁ *ἀπαράβατος* ἐπιβιώσεως ὅρος! Ἀλλ' *οὐδεὶς* τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν *ἀναριθμήτων* δημαγωγῶν, κατασκυλεύοντων τὸ δι' αὐτῶν *πεπτωκὸς* ἐθνικὸν σῶμα, εἰσηγείται *πάνθ' ἄπερ καλῶς ὁ λαὸς γινώσκειν ὀφείλει!* Ὡς *ἄκοπος, ὡς ἂν τις* τοιαύτη *ὑπάρχη, καρ' ἀνεπίτευκτος* ἐν τῇ οὐσίᾳ αὐτοῦ νῦν ἐπιχειρεῖται λύσις τοῦ *Προβλήματος* τῆς Ἑλλάδος, οὐδὲν ἐπιτευχθήσεται τίμιον·

καὶ *πάσα ἥσσω τῆς ἀπαιτουμένης* ἐπὶ τοῦτο προσπάθεια μᾶλλον ἀνωφελὴς ἔσεται! Ταῦτα πρὸς *συμμελέτην* τοῦ πρὸ ὑμῶν καὶ πάντων ἡμῶν ὅλου προβλήματος!

Περὶ δὲ *τάμεσα* οἰκονομικὰ ἐφ' ὧν συγκεντροῦτε *πάσαν* τὴν προσοχὴν καὶ περὶ ἧς μόν' ὑπισχνείσθ' ὑποστήριξιν τοῖς ἔχουσιν "*άμεσο* *έννομο* *συμφέρον*, ὡς *άπαιτεῖ* τὸ *Σύνταγμα*, καὶ θίγονται ἀπὸ το *επιλεκτικό* *χάρισμα* *χρεών* με το οποίο *άσκειται* σε βάρος τους *αθέμιτος* *άνταγωνισμός*, **ή που θα έπρεπε να περιληφθοῦν** σε σχετικές ρυθμίσεις *άν* *υπήρχαν* *άντικειμενικά* *κριτήρια* *που* *να* *ικανοποιοῦν* *την* *αρχή* *της* *ισότητος*", ταῦτα δεῖ λέγεσθαι: "Ὅτι *δι' ἰδιοτέλειαν* κατηγορηθῆναι *κινδυνεύουσιν* οἱ οὕτω προσφεύγοντες, *λογιζόμενοι* ὡς *άδιάφοροι* *περὶ* τὸ *άνήθικον* *τοῦ* *άδίκου* *καὶ* *χαριστικού* *προσφάτου* *αὐτοῦ* *νόμου*, *έάν* *κατὰ* *τὴν* *ὡς* *ύμεῖς* *αὐτὴν* *έρμηνεύετ'* *αρχὴν* *τῆς* *"ισότητος"* *περιλάβω* *ντο* *έν* *αὐτῷ*! Ὑμεῖς δέ, *κάν* *άγαθὴν* *πρόθεσιν* *έχητε*, *ὅτι* *πρὸς* *ἰδιοτέλειαν* *αὐτοῦς* *έξωθεῖτε*!:

(1) Διότι *άπάδει* *πρὸς* *τὴν* *εὐφυΐαν* *τόσων* *καθηγητῶν* τὸ δοκεῖν τούτους πιστεύοντας ὅτι, *έν* *τῇ* *άδίκῳ* *οὐ* *δέ* *μὴν* *άλλα* *καὶ* *πονηρᾷ* *ήμῶν* *χώρᾳ*, *εὗρε* *θήσονται* *τινες* *άφελεῖς* *έκ* *τοῦ* *γενικοῦ* *πληθυσμοῦ* *οἵτινες* *πλέον* *τοῦ* *ἠύξη* *μένως* *κατ'* *αὐτῶν* *έπιπίπτοντος* *φόρου* *ανάληψονται* *καὶ* *τὴν* *πρόσθετον* *μεγάλην* *δαπάνην* *τοῦ* *παρ'* *ύμῶν* *προτεινομένου* *έπὶ* *δικαστηρίῳ* *άγῶνος*, *ὃν* *ύμεῖς* *αὐτοῖ* *ὡς* *όργανισμός* *οὕτως* *άποποιεῖσθε*· διότι *κάλλιον* *παντός* *έτέρου* *γιγνώσκετε* *καὶ* *τάμφίβολον*, *καὶ* *τὸ* *δαπανηρότατον* *τούτου*, *καὶ* *τὸ* *οἰκονομικώτατον* *τῇ* *γενικῇ* *τοῦ* *τόπου* *οἰκονομίας* *τῆς* *παρ'* *ύμῶν* *αὐτῶν* *ανάληψ* *εως* *τούτου*, *καθότι* *έλάχιστα* *ποιηθήσονται* *τότε* *τὰ* *οἷα* *περιττὰ* *ώφελεν* *εἶναι* *συνολικά* *δικαστικά* *έξοδα*, *μονίμως* *άποσυρόμενα* *άπὸ* *τῆς* *ύπηρεσίας* *έτέρων* *παραγωγικῶν* *άναγκῶν*, *καὶ* *τὴν* *μεγάλην* *ζημίαν* *ἣν* *προκαλοῦσιν* *τῷ* *έθνει* *αἱ* *άέναοι* *"νομικαὶ"* *φλναρίαι* *έν* *αῖς* *καταδαπανώμεθα* *ὡς* *λαὸς* *άντὶ* *τοῦ* *δημιουργεῖν* *άληθῇ* *έθνικόν* *πλοῦτον*!

(2) Διότι παρότι γινώσκετε ὅτι διὰ τοῦ νόμου αὐτοῦ *άδικοῦνται* *πάντες* *οἱ* *διὰ* *τῆς* *γενικῆς* *φορολογίας* *καλούμενοι* *καλύψαι* *τὸν* *άδικον* *αὐτὸν* *χαρισμόν*, *άρα* *δ'* *οὖν* *καὶ* *ύμεῖς* *αὐτοῖ*, *οὐχ* *ύμεῖς* *εὐθέως* *προσφεύγετε* *κατὰ* *τοῦ* *νόμου* *αὐτοῦ*, *άλλ'* *άλλους*, *ἰδιώτας*, *έπὶ* *τὸ* *έργον* *τούτο* *καλεῖτε*, *ὅσους* *άν* *δύνωνται*, *λαβεῖν* *παρ'* *ύμῶν* *κατ'* *αὐτοῦ* *άρωγὴν*!

(3) Διότι γινώσκετε καὶ (α) τὸ *πονηρότατον* *παρ'* *ήμῖν* *συνταγματικὸν* *καθεστῶς*, *οὐνεκα* *οὐδ'* *ύπάρχει* *συνταγματικὸν* *δικαστήριο* *δυνάμενον* *καταρρίψαι* *σύνολόν* *τινα* *νόμον* (*προφανῶς* *ἵνα* *μὴ* *"ζημιώσωσιν"* *οἱ* *δι'* *αὐτοῦ* *κακῶς* *ώφελούμενοι*!), *οὐδέ* *τις* *δυνατότης* *γενικῆς* *καταρρίψεως* *διάταξεως* *τινος* *νόμου* *τινός*, *άλλ'* *είδικῆς* *μόνον* *κατὰ* *τὴν* *έκάστου* *προσφεύγοντος* *ἰδιάζουσιν* *μοῖραν* (*προφανῶς* *ἵνα* *μὴ* *πλείονες* *τῶν* *έλαχίστων* *δυνατῶν* *δικαιωθῶσιν* *έκ* *τῶν* *πολλῶν* *διὰ* *τοῦ* *νόμου* *κακῶς* *πλὴν* *σκοπίμως* *ζημιουμένων*!)· *οὐ* *άκριβῶς* *ένεκα* *καὶ* *πάντη* *προσεκτικῇ* *διάκρισις* *γίγνεται* *μεταξὺ* *τοῦ* *"άμέσου"* *καὶ* *"έμμέσου"* *νομίμου* *συμφέροντος* (*τοῦ* *πρώτου* *μόνου* *κάν* *άποδειχθῇ* *άναγνωριζομένου*, *τοῦ* *δὲ* *δευτέρου* *αὐτὸ* *άπορριπτομένου*) καὶ (β) ὅτι ἡ *διοίκησις* *σκοπίμως* *περιφρονεῖ* *τὰς* *δικαστικὰς* *άποφάσεις*, *ὅσας* *γε* *ἡ* *δικαστικὴ* *έξουσία* (*ὑπὸ* *τῆς* *έκτελεστικῆς* *αἰσχροῦς* *διοριζομένης*!) *άδυνατεῖ* *άγνοεῖν*!

(4) Διότι *γιγνώσκετε* ὅτι τὰ δικαστήρια ἐνώπιον τῆς τοιαύτης συνταγματικῆς ἀδυναμίας πρὸ νόμων ἀδίκων καταφεύγουσιν εἰς τὸ *ἀντίθετον ἄκρον*, "δικαιοῦντα" τουτέστι *περιλαμβάνοντα εἰς τὰς χαριστικὰς τοιαύτας "ρυθμίσεις"* καὶ *πάντας τοὺς ἐπιτυχῶς* κατ' αὐτῶν εἰς αὐτὰ καταφεύγοντας, ἀλλ' ὅμως *ἐπιτείνοντα οὕτω* τὴν *μάλα μείζονα γενικὴν ἀδικίαν* κατὰ τῶν "μὴ δικαιουμένων" ὥς "μὴ ἐχόντων ἄμεσον" νόμιμον συμφέρον· οὐνεκα καὶ ὑμεῖς νῦν καταφαίνεσθ' ἐπιχειροῦντες *διεύρυνσιν ὑπὲρ "φίλων"* μᾶλλον ἢ μείωσιν τῆς *γενικῆς ἀδικίας*, εἴτε μέσῳ δικαστικῶν ἀποφάσεων, εἴτε μέσῳ *προσθέτων νομοθετημάτων* ἂν ἡ κυβέρνησις ἀμφοτέροθεν πιεζομένη μᾶλλον ἢ καταργήσῃ τὸν ἀδικον νόμον *περιλάβῃ εἰς αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς ἐπιτυχῶς κατ' αὐτοῦ διαμαρτυρομένους!*

(5) Διότι *οὕτως οὐκ αἶρεται ἀλλ' αὐξάνεται* ἡ ἥσσω παρούσα συνολικὴ ἀδικία καθ' ἧς *καλῶς* μὲν ὑμεῖς βάλλετε *κακὸν ὅμως* εἰσηγεῖσθε τρόπον ἀμύνης!

(6) Διότι *πῶς* διέφυγεν ἀπὸ τῶν καθηγητῶν ἡ *μεγάλη* τῆς τοιαύτης "ρυθμίσεως" πιθανότης κατὰ τὰ *σταθερὰ πλὴν ἄσῳτα* εἰωθότα τοῦ κοινοβουλίου ἡμῶν ἐνεργούντος ἀτελευτητύως, *πονηρῶς καὶ χαριστικῶς ὑπὲρ "φίλων"*!;

(7) Διότι *οὐκ ἔστι πιστευτὸν* τοσοῦτον κακῶς συμβουλευεῖν ὑμᾶς τὸ ὑφ' ὑμᾶς ἐξ ἐπιστημόνων συμβούλιον!

Οὐδεμίαν διὰ τῶν ἀνωτέρω ἐπιθυμῶ ἀσκῆσαι καθ' ὑμῶν κριτικὴν! *Καλοπίστως καὶ φιλικῶς* γράφω ὑμῖν! Ἵνα καταδείξω τὸ *πολὺ μείζον* πρὸ πάντων ἡμῶν κείμενον ἔργον, τῶν *καλλίονα τῆς παρούσης* ἐπιθυμούντων ἰδεῖν ποτε τὴν Ἑλλάδα! Διόπερ ἀπὸ τῶν *πολιτισμικῶν καὶ πολιτικῶν αὐτῆς θεμελίων* δεῖ ἡμᾶς ἄρξεσθαι ἐν οἷς *χρὴ συναθροῖζεσθαι* πάντα τὰ αἰώνια *λογικά, φιλοσοφικά καὶ ἠθικά* ἀπαραίτητα· ὦν ἄνευ, ὅλως *σαθρὰ πάντα τὰ προσδοκώμενα ἔσονται, κἀπικινδυνώτατα* ἂν ἄνευ τῶν ὥς ἄνω ἀπαραιτήτων οἱ ἀνόητ' οἰκοδομῶσι! Τοιαῦτα σκεπτόμενος περὶ τοῦ Προβλήματος τῆς Ἑλλάδος, *ὥς ἤδη πολλὰ εἶπον*, οὐδὲν ἕτερον *χρὴ με λέγειν*, ἵνα μὴ ὑμεῖς τε *κἀγὼ ἀπολέσωμεν ἔτι πλείονα χρόνον* ἂν πρὸς ἀλλήλους *διαφωνῶμεν!* Συμφωνοῦντες ὅμως, ἂν *εὐρεθῶμεν, ὥς γε καὶ θερμῶς εὐχομαι*, τότε καὶ *πλείονα καὶ προσφορώτερ' ἔξομεν λέγειν!*

Φιλικώτατα καὶ εὐχόμενος,

Re: ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΣΙΣ ΑΡΧΙΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΙΚΗΣ ΔΡΑΣΕΩΣ

Μακαριώτατον Κύριον Χριστόδουλον
Ἀρχιεπίσκοπον τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις καὶ πάσῃ Ἑλλάδι
Ὁρθοδόξου τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας
Ἱερὰν Ἀρχιεπισκοπὴν Ἀθηνῶν
Ἀθήνας

21 Μαΐου 1998.

Μακαριώτατε!:

Εἴη ὁ ἀναστὰς Κύριος μεθ' ὑμῶν, παρέχων ὑμῖν πάντα τὰ δῶρα τῆς πίστεως, φωτισμοῦ, ὑπομονῆς καὶ ἀγάπης, ὧν ἄνευ ἀσφαλῶς οὐκ ἔνεστιν ὑμᾶς ἐξαρκέσειν κατενώπιον τοῦ ὄντως δεινοῦ πρὸ ὑμῶν ἔργου, ὅπερ διὰ τῆς ἀναρρήσεως ὑμῶν ἀνελάβετε· ἐφ' ἣ καὶ συγχαίρω ὑμῖν!

Ὡς πάντας συστρατευθῆν· ἐκαλέσατε τοὺς πιστεύοντας, ἰδοὺ καγὼ σπεύδων παρέξειν ὑμῖν τὰς κατωτέρω ὁδυνηρὰς σκέψεις περὶ τοῦ πρακτέου! Καὶ γὰρ πάντας αὐτοὺς συνεκίνησεν ἡ ὑμετέρα αἵτησις παροχῆς παρὰ τῶν νέων πρὸς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους συγγνώμης, δι' ὅνπερ ἡμεῖς παραδίδομεν αὐτοῖς κόσμον! Πλὴν, ἵνα μὴ παραμείνωσιν ἡ μὲν συγκίνησις μόνη, ὁ δὲ βαθὺς οὗτος ὑμῶν λόγος κενός, χίνα μὴ οὐδεὶς γενήσῃται σοφώτερος δι' αὐτῶν, ὥσγε πάντες ὀφείλομεν, ἐπιτρέψατέ μοι εἰσηγεῖσθαι ὑμῖν ὅπως κατὰ τὴν ἀπαραίτητον κἀναμενομένην ἐπομένην δημοσίαν ὑμῶν μνείαν *τάμοι-βαίου πρὸς ἀλλήλας χρέους τῶν γενεῶν*, οὐ μόνων τῶν νεωτέρων πρὸς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἴσως πρὸς τοὺς νεωτέρους, ἀπὸ Γενέσεως ἕως τῆς Συντελείας, οὗ ἄνευ μηδεὶς δικαιωθήσεται ἐνώπιον τοῦ Κυρίου, κατὰ τὸ παρ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Παύλου λεχθέν, ποιήσητε *πλήρη ἀναφορὰν εἰς τὸ μείζον αὐτὸ πρόβλημα κατὰ τὰ ὧδε ἀκολουθοῦντα!*

Καὶ γὰρ δικαίως ἐπεμείνατε *ὡς ἐκ καθήκοντος βαρὺν λόγον ἔχειν ἐπὶ παντὸς τῶν ἀνθρώπων προβλήματος· ὅτι οὐχ ὑλικά, ἀλλὰ πνευματικά κυριώτατ' ἐστὶ αὐτῶν τὰ προβλήματα!* Πλὴν, ἡ τελεία περὶ τὰ πνευματικὰ ἀπαιδευσία ὡς καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ κράτους ταγῶν (ὧν οἱ σπουδαιότατοι *σκοπίμως ἠρνήθησαν παραστήναι*, οἱ δὲ *παραστάντες ἀναισχύντως καὶ θρασύτατα ἐν μέσῳ ναοῦ προσεπάθησαν φιμῶσαι οὐ μόνον ὑμᾶς ἀλλὰ δι' ὑμῶν καὶ πάντας τοὺς πνευματικῶς ἐπιμένοντας λόγον ἔχειν* κατὰ τῶν ἐν τῷ παρόντι κόσμῳ τεκταινομένων, τῷ μὴ ποσῶς ἀνήκοντι τῷ καίσαρι ἀλλὰ τῷ Κυρίῳ Θεῷ μόνῳ!) καταμαρτυρεῖ τὸ δεινὸν ὄντως μέγεθος τοῦ πρὸ ὑμῶν ὑψουμένου προβλήματος *ὑπομονητικῆς καὶ λεπτομεροῦς πνευματικῆς ποδηγεσίας τε καὶ διδασκαλίας* τῶν ἕως κἀν αὐτῇ τῇ Βουλῇ τε καὶ Κυβερνήσει καθημένων πνευματικῶν νηπίων καὶ νάνων! [Αἱ μεθ' ὧν ἀκολουθήσασαι δημόσιαι

περιπτύξεις μόνον βαθὺ ἄλγος προκαλοῦσι τοῖς καλῶς κατανοοῦσι, καὶ τοῦ-
λάχιστον ἀπορίαν τοῖς κατὰ διαίσθησιν μᾶλλον ἢ κατανόησιν παρακολου-
θοῦσι, τὰ τεκταινόμενα! Καὶ γὰρ οἱ θρασεῖς *πρὸ οὐδενὸς ὀρροδοῦσι καὶ*
μᾶλλον ἀγάλλονται φιλήματα δημόσια προδοσίας διδόναι τοῖς τοιαῦτ' ἄδυ-
νατοῦσιν ἀρνεῖσθαι λαμβάνειν, οὓς οὕτως **they compromise** ἀναγκάζοντες
τούτους μετέχειν εἰς αἰσχρὸν θέατρον, δι' οὗ μόνον τὸ κακὸν ὀφελεῖται καὶ
τὸ καλὸν βλάπτεται περιπτυσσόμενον τὸ κακόν!]

Δι' ὅπερ νῦν καταφαινόμενον ἀπιστίας, ἀπαιδευσίας, ὑποκρισίας, οὐ δέ
μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ *ἐσκεμμένης δημοσίας διδασκομένης κακότητος* δεινότατον
πρόβλημα, οὐ μόνη ἡ νῦν ἄρχουσα γενεὰ ὀφείλει συγγνώμην παρὰ τῶν νεω-
τέρων αἰτεῖν, ἀλλ' αὕτη φεῦ πᾶσα ἡ ἐν τῷ παρόντι κόσμῳ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλη-
σία, *κυρίως δ' ἡ αὐταποκαλουμένη Ὁρθόδοξος*, ὅτι αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ πλέον πά-
σης ἐτέρας εἰς χεῖρας πνευματικῶς ἀπαιδευτῶν ἐγκαταλιποῦσα τὸν *πνευ-
ματικῶς σπουδαιότατον* (διὰ τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐτοιμάζεσθαι τοὺς πολίτας τοῦ
"ἐπερχομένου") "*παρόντα*" αἰῶνα, διὰ τῆς *παρατήσεως* ἀπὸ τοῦ *χριστιανι-
κοῦ ταύτης καθήκοντος* τοῦ δημοσίως διελέγχειν τὰς πράξεις τῶν ἡγετῶν,
θρασύτατα ἑαυτοὺς θέντων ὑπὲρ πάντα νόμον ἀνθρώπων τε καὶ Θεοῦ, ὡς
πάλιν κατέδειξαν καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀπουσίας αὐτῶν, ἀναγκασάντων ὑμᾶς εἰς τὰς
πρὸς αὐτοὺς πρώτας ἐπισκέψεις, δι' ὧν *αὐθις εἰς θέσιν θεραπαινίδος* τού-
του τοῦ *πονηροῦ κόσμου* ἐπιμένουσι καταδείξαι τὴν Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίαν,
τὸν δ' Ἐνα Χριστὸν τε καὶ Θεὸν μὴ ὅλως ὄντα!

Τοῦτο γὰρ δεῖ ἡμᾶς πάντας κατανοεῖν: Ὅτι ἐν τούτῳ τῷ κόσμῳ τρέ-
φονται μὲν ἡ πεινῶσι κοιλίαι, κυρίως ὅμως δ' ἀνδρῶνται ἢ καταγυμνοῦνται
Λογικὰ πνεύματα καὶ ψυχαί! Τίνες οὖν τίνων εἰσὶ κύριοι; Ἐν τῷδε γε κό-
σμῳ, οὗ γε κοιλιῶν οἱ *Λογικοὶ* νόοι καὶ αἱ ψυχαί! Ὅτι ἡ τούτων Ὁρθὴ κατὰ
Λόγον ἀναλογία ἀπώλετο [κατὰ μὲν τοὺς βυζαντινοὺς χρόνους *διὰ τῆς πε-
ριφρονήσεως τῆς "κοιλίας"*, φυσικῶς ἐκπνευσάσης *πρὸ* τῆς πληρώσεως τῆς
ὑπηρεσίας αὐτῆς ἐφ' ἣ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ ἐτάχθη παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, *χοῦτω*
συμπαρασυράσης εἰς ἀφανισμόν καὶ τὸ κράτος· κατὰ δὲ τὸν παρόντα και-
ρὸν διὰ τῆς *περιφρονήσεως τοῦ Λογικοῦ νοῦ καὶ ψυχῆς*, ἐξ ἧς αἰτίας *πάν*
μεταβάλλεται εἰς περίττωμα, ἀπολλυμένου παντὸς ἐκτὸς τούτου ἐτέρου
τοῦ βίου σκοποῦ] *εἰς μόνην ὀφείλεται τὴν ἔλλειψιν πλήρους κατανοήσεως,*
παρ' αὐτῆς γε κυρίως τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, τῆς πνευματικῆς σημασίας τούτου
τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ τὴν *περὶ ταύτης παντελῆ ἔλλειψιν παιδείας* παντὸς τοῦ
λαοῦ, *περιλαμβάνοντος καὶ τοὺς ἡγέτας αὐτοῦ*· αὐτοῦ μὲν ἄνευ ὁδηγῶν πα-
ραπαίοντος πρὸ τοῦ κρημνοῦ, αὐτοὺς δὲ αὐθις τε καὶ λυπηρότατα καταδει-
κνύντας ἑαυτοὺς μάλιστα κατωτέρους τῶν παρουσῶν δεινῶν περιστάσεων!

Κατὰ ταῦτα, ἐν τούτῳ τῷ κόσμῳ, *δικαίως* μενοῦνγε ὁ καῖσαρ δοκεῖ μεί-
ζονα (*ἀλλ' οὐ καὶ τὸν μέγιστον*) λόγον ἔχειν· *καθότι μόνος τρέφει κοιλίας*
κἀναλόγως δι' αὐτῶν *τὰς ψυχάς*, ἐφ' ᾧ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τέτακται! *Δικαιότε-
ρον* δ' ὅμως ἐστὶ τὸ κατανοεῖν τοὺς ἀξίους *πνευματικούς, οὐ τοὺς πολιτι-
κούς*, ἔχοντας οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ *τηροῦντας* καὶ τούτῳ τῷ κόσμῳ τὸν μέγι-
στον λόγον, καθότι ὁ Θεὸς *τούτους κατέστησεν εὐθέως ἐπὶ τὸ τρέφειν νό-
ους τε καὶ ψυχάς*, δι' ἃς *ἅπας* οὗτος ὁ κόσμος ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ κατεσκευά-
σται! Τῶν πνευματικῶν οὖν ἐστὶ τὸ δεινὸν χρέος μηδέποτε ἀποκάνειν μι-

μνησκειν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ταύτην ὅπου εἰσὶν ἀνθρώπων ψυχαί, οὐκ ἐν μόνοις ναοῖς! Δημοσίᾳ οὖν ἐρωτήσατε οὕτως αὐτοὺς εἴπερ τὰς κοιλίας ἢ τοὺς νόους καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς σπουδαιοτέρας δοκοῦσιν! Ἵνα πάντες, αὐτοὺς, οὐ δὲ μὴν ἀλλὰ χεῖραυτοὺς, καταγνῶσι! Πᾶσα γὰρ περαιτέρω μετὰ τούτων περίπτυξις στραγγαλισμὸς τῆς Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας ἐστί, καὶ προδοσία τοῦ παρὰ Κεῖνου δι' ὑμῶν καὶ πάντων ἡμῶν ἔτι ἀναμένοντος ποιείσθ' ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ σωστικοῦ ἔργου!

Πλὴν ἐν τούτῳ τῷ ποιεῖν, *συνομολογῶν ἅμα τὸ μέγιστον τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ὅλης ἀπὸ μακρῶν αἰώνων ἀμάρτημα, δεινῶς ὑπεριδούσης* τὴν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου *μεγίστην καθαρὰν πνευματικὴν σημασίαν*, ἐν ᾧ ἠθέλησεν ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς *καθ' ὅλα τελείους* ἐτοιμάζεσθαι γενήσεσθαι Παραδείσου Πολίτας· οὐχ ἀπλῶς μεριμνώντας περὶ μόνην τὴν κατὰ τὰ *συνήθη* "σωτηριάν" ψυχῆς, κὰς τῶν ἀπίστων τὰς βλασφήμους χεῖρας καὶ πράξεις *καταλείποντας* τοῦτον πάντα τὸν *ἐκ Θεοῦ μόνου* κόσμον! Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ μέγιστον πάντων καὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας Ὁρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας ἀμάρτημα, οἱ πρέσβεις τῶν ἀπανταχοῦ νῦν ἐλευθέρως δρώντων ἀθέων, *φαινόμενοι ἀγαθοί* τε καὶ εὐσεβεῖς, ἀφελεῖς ἀπατῶσι κὰν μέσῳ ναοῦ, Θεῖα ἐπικαλούμενοι ῥήματα θρασύτατα τὸν Θεὸν βλασφημοῦντες, ὡς αὐτῶν μόνων ἴδιον δοκοῦντες τὸν "παρόντα" αἰῶνα! Ὡς ὅμως οὗτος προθάλαμός ἐστι τοῦ "ἐπερχομένου" [κακῶς οὕτως ἔτι ὑπὸ τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀποκαλουμένου, ὡς *ὄντως ἀρξαμένου* διὰ τῆς Χριστοῦ Ἀναστάσεως], *στενωτάτῃ ἄρα χῆ ἀδιάσπαστος* μετὰ τῶν *δύο πνευματικῇ μόνῃ συνάφεια*! Ἦτις *οὐδεμίαν* ἐπιτρέπει "συναλληλίαν" καλοῦ καὶ κακοῦ, ἀληθείας καὶ ψεύδους, πιστῶν ἀπεργαζομένων τοὺς σκοποὺς τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ δεδηλωμένων Ἐκείνου ἐχθρῶν ἀπεργαζομένων τὴν ἡτταν τοῦ Θεοῦ Σχεδίου! Ἐγκαταλείψομεν οὖν πάντα τὰ μεγάλα, καὶ νῦν ἔτι ἐπιζῶντα ὡς οὐδέποτε *βαθέως ἐξετασθέντα* βυζαντινά, ῥητορικά, κὰν *δηθεν "εὐλαβῇ"*, *καθαρά ψεύδη*! Ἄλλος ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Καῖσαρ! Ἄλλος δ' οὗτός ἐστι νῦν! Μὴν ἀπατᾶσθε! Καὶ μὴν, ἐν τούτῳ, διὰ τὴν "παράδοσιν", συνεξαπατᾶτε καὶ τοὺς ἐφ' ὑμῖν πεποιθότας διὰ τὴν ἀγάπην Χριστοῦ! Νῦν ἐπερίσσευσε τὸ ποικίλον τῶν βλασφημῶν περίττωμα, κὰν τούτῳ νῦν κυλινδοῦνται ψυχαί, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκψύχεται· *χὸ ἄνθρωπος*, κυρίως δ' ὁ νέος, ἀπόλλυται *χὼς ἂν ἡ ζῶν νεκρὸς* μηδὲν περὶ ζωῆς καταγνοὺς ἐπὶ γῆς περιφέρεται!

Ὅτι *μεῖζον ἀληθῶς* ἐστί τοῦτο τὸ πρόβλημα διὰ τοὺς αὐταποκαλουμένους "Ὁρθοδόξους" λαοὺς ἢ τοὺς λοιποὺς τῶν χριστιανικῶν *καταδείκνυτ' εὐθέως* *χὺπὸ τῆς μείζονος* *παρὰ τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας* ἢ *παρὰ κείνων ἐγκαταλείψεως* τοῦ παρόντος κόσμου· *τουτέστιν εἰς τὰς χεῖρας* αὐτοῦ τοῦ διαβόλου, ἀπορριφθέντος μὲν ὡς δευτέρας ἀνάρχου ἀρχῆς, πλὴν ὅμως δὲ *συνεχῶς ὑπονοουμένου ὡς ὄντως* *δηθεν ἀρχῆς-ἐξουσίας* τοῦ "παρόντος" αἰῶνος· ἐφ' οὗ ὡς μόνος ἄρχων κυριαρχεῖ *διὰ μόνην τὴν παρὰ τῆς Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας ὅλως ἀπερίσκεπτον* χερσὶν αὐτοῦ τοῦ κόσμου παράδοσιν ὡς καὶ *μετὰ τὴν Ἀνάστασιν*, οὐδέποθ' ἕως τοῦ νῦν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ σημασίᾳ Αὐτῆς κατανοηθεῖσαν, τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ παλαιοῦ ἔτι *διανομένου θεωρουμένου* καὶ *παρ' αὐτῶν* ἔτι τῶν Χριστιανῶν, *παρορώντων* τὸν ἤδη παρόντα *Καινὸν* *σὺν Χριστῷ ἀναστάντι Αἰῶνα*!

Ὡς δεινὴ ὄντως ἐστί νῦν ἡ κατάστασις τῆς Ἑλλάδος, πάντως οὐ διὰ

τῆς ξένης ὑπονομεύσεως ἐφθάσαμεν ᾧδε, ἀλλὰ κατὰ *πάσαν τὴν περὶ τοῦ-
του τοῦ κόσμου βυζαντινὴν ἡμετέραν παράδοσιν!* Καὶ μᾶλλον ἔτι ἀποτευξό-
μεθα τοῦ πρὸ ἡμῶν κειμένου καθήκοντος, ἐὰν ἐπ' ἄλλοτρίων ἐπιμείνωμεν
ἐπιρρίπτειν τὰς ἀποκλειστικῶς ἡμετέρας εὐθύνας! Ὡς πρῶτοι ποτ' ἦμεν
μεταξὺ τῶν λαῶν, καὶ μόνον ὅτι ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ μόνοι ἐπετρέψαμεν ἑαυτοῖς
ὑπερκερασθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν μακρόθεν ἀκολουθούντων καταμαρτυρεῖ τὴν ἐπ'
αἰῶνας μακροὺς ὅλως τραγικὴν ἀβελτερίαν, εἰ μὴ καὶ πλήρη τυφλότητα,
τῶν *δῆθεν* πνευματικῶν καὶ λοιπῶν τοῦ τόπου τούτου ταγῶν! Συνεκλόνησεν
ὄντως, πλὴν μόνον διὰ τὰκουσθῆναι, ὁ περὶ συγγνώμης λόγος ὑμῶν! Ἀλλὰ
φεῦ, πλὴν ἐὰν ἐγὼ νῦν μεγάλως ὑμᾶς ἀδικῶ, *οὐκ* ἐξεφράσθην ἐν *τούτῳ τῷ
ὀλικῷ* πνεύματι! Καὶ διὰ *τοῦτο* ἀπέτυχε κατασυντρίψαι τὸν χαλύβδινον θώ-
ρακ' ἀναισθησίας καὶ σείσαι τὸ ἐσώτατον, εἴ τι αἰσθανόμενον ἔτι ἐκεῖ πα-
ραμένει, τῶν πλείστων ἀκροατῶν ὑμῶν, *οἵτινες καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἀκοῦσαι συνε-
χίζουσιν ὡς καὶ πρότερον, ὡς μηδέποτε τι ἀκούσαντες!* Διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν
ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ τε καὶ Χριστῷ τε καὶ Πνεύματι, *Αὐτῷ τῷ πλήρει κάδιαι-
ρέτῳ Ἐνὶ Λόγῳ*, ἐφθάσαμεν οἱ νῦν Ἕλληνες ᾧδε! Καὶ δεινότατ' αὐταπατώ-
μεθ' ἂν δοκῶμεν ὅτι ἔχομέν τι κοινὸν μετὰ τῶν θεμελιωσάντων καὶ παραγα-
γόντων καὶ νῦν ἔτι δημιουργούντων τὸν μέγαν παρόντα πολιτισμὸν ἐφ' οὗ
συνεποχοῦνται χοῖ ἀπνευμάτιστοι, εἴτε διὰ τὴν τυχούσαν συνωνυμίαν, εἴτε
καὶ ἄνευ αὐτῆς! Ὁ Παρθενῶν αὐτὸς *πρῶτος* ἐπὶ γῆς ἦν ὁ Ἱερὸς Ναὸς τῆς
Σοφίας Θεοῦ! Διὰ *βαθυτάτην* Θεολογίαν εἶδον οἱ Ἀρχαῖοι τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν (ἄλ-
λο τοῦτ' ὄνομα τῆς Θεοῦ μόνου Νοήσεως) πάνοπλον γεγεννημένην Παρθέ-
νον ἀπὸ τῆς Κεφαλῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ-Διός! Ἀλλὰ πόσοι τῶν ἀκολουθησάντων, καὶ
δὴ τῶν ὡς *Χριστιανῶν* φερομένων, τῶν ἐν τούτῳ τῷ τόπῳ ζώντων, τῶν τοῦ
Ἱεροῦ Βράχου ἐπισκεπτῶν, τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ τῶν Βαρβάρων, πάντων τῶν ἐν-
θέων καὶ τῶν ἀθέων, διὰ παντὸς κατενόησαν τοῦτο; Χῶς ἀπὸ πάντων αὐτῶν
τοῦτο διέφυγε, τίνων ἄρα ἐστὶν ἡ διὰ τοῦτο πλήρης εὐθύνη; *Μόνη πενταε-
τία* ἐξήρκεσε τότε' ἐς τὸ ἀνεγείρειν τὸν Παρθενῶνα, ὃν ἡμεῖς ἔτι ἐν βδελύγ-
μασι περιβάλλομεν! *Ποῖον* ἔργον ὑψίστου πολιτισμοῦ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἐποιήσα-
μεν εἰς δεκαπλάσιον χρόνον, καταναλισκόμενοι εἰς *βλασφήμους* ἀτέρμονας
"συζητήσεις" *δικαιολογιῶν διὰ τὸ μηδέποτε τι τὸ μέγα ποιεῖν*, ἵνα μόνον
τὸ *μεῖον* προσβλητικὸν νῦν ὑπομνήσω; Ὡς οὖν ἡ ἐν τῇ Πόλει "Ἁγία Σοφία"
δεύτερος ναὸς τῆς Θεοῦ Σοφίας ἐστί, *πῶς* ἐστί δίκαιον μὴ ὡς πρῶτον τὸν
πρῶτον αὐτὸν ἡμᾶς ἐκλαμβάνειν, χυπὸ τὸ *πλήρες* αὐτοῦ Πνεῦμα μὴ σεμνῶς
ὡς λαὸν ζῆν· ὑφ' ὃν ὁ Κύριος Παντοκράτωρ ἐπανεπέτρεψεν ἡμῖν ζῆν, ἀπο-
στρέψας ἐν τέλει τὸ βλέμμ' ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπ' Αὐτὸν ἐφ' ἑνδεκα ὅλους αἰῶνας
τὸν Θεὸν λατρευσάντων ἀλλ' ὅμως περὶ Θείας Σοφίας μηδέν, ὡς ἔτι χήμεις
αὐτοί, κατανοησάντων, καὶ τὴν Ὁρθοδοξίαν ἐκλαβόντων ὡς πλήρη, πλὴν
ἄνευ τινὸς κατανοήσεως τῆς πνευματικῆς οὐσίας τοῦ παρόντος κόσμου· ἐν
ᾧ καὶ διὰ πάντων τῶν *ἔργων πολιτισμοῦ* τοῦ νοῦ καὶ τῶν χειρῶν ἡμῶν, τοῦ
ὅλου τάνθρώπου πνεύματος ὑπηρετικῶν, διέταξεν ὁ Θεὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ
πράγματα· κοῦχί διὰ μόνων τῶν Κείνου λατρευτικῶν, ὡς ἔτι οἱ δῆθεν Ὁρθό-
δοξοὶ θεωροῦσιν, ὡς ἂν διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν *χειλικὴν μόνην* Ἐκείνου λατρείαν
Ἐκεῖνος ἐδημιούργησε τὸν ὑλικὸν κόσμον; *Πῶς* οὖν ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς χριστιανι-
κῶς ὑπὸ τὸν Παρθενῶνα δοκοῦμεν διαβιούντας, ἐνῶ ἐν πᾶσι περιττώμασι δι'

ἡμέρας τε καὶ νυκτὸς κυλινδούμεθα· τούτῳ τὰ μέσῳ ἡμῶν περιβάλλονται πλήρως ἐξομοιούμενοι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὑπ' αὐτοῦ οὐδ' ἐπ' ἐλάχιστα προσβαλλόμενοι;

Θερμότερα οὖν κατὰ ταῦτα παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς ὅπως καὶ περὶ τούτων ἀναλογισθῆτε: Θεωρεῖτε ἀληθῶς μείζονα τὸν τούτου τοῦ τόπου *παρόντα* πολιτισμόν (*ἀφαιρουμένου* παντὸς τοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκ τῆς "Δύσεως" εἰσηγμένου στοιχείου), ἢ τὸν ἐκείνης; Ἐὰν μὲν ναί, παρακαλῶ *καταδείξατε καὶ εὐθαρσῶς ἐν Χριστῷ πείθων εἶπατε* ἡμῖν καὶ τοῖς λαοῖς πᾶσιν! Ἐὰν δ' ὅμως οὐ, κἂν συμφωνῇτε ὅτι *ἱστορικῶς, ἄρα δὲ καὶ διὰ τοῦ Βυζαντίου*, ἤχθημεν ᾧδε, πῶς οὖν διάφορος τοῦ ἡμετέρου (*καθαροῦ* ἀπὸ "δυτικῶν" ἐπιδράσεων) ἦν ἂν χὸ κείνης πολιτισμός, εἰ βυζαντινῶς Ὁρθόδοξος κάκεινη διετηρεῖτο; Ἀληθῶς φρονεῖτε ὅτι χριστιανικῶς τελειότατος καὶ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἐγγύτατος ἦν ὁ ὅλος βυζαντινὸς βίος, ἢ πως ἀμείνων παντὸς ἑτέρου ὑπάρξαντος ἢ ὑπάρξοντος; Διατί οὖν οὐκ ἐπέφερεν ὁ Θεὸς τὴν Συντέλειαν τοῦ κόσμου παντός, ἀλλὰ *μόνην* τὴν τοῦ Βυζαντίου; Ἐὰν τιμωρεῖ ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς ἀρίστους ἄδικος ὢν, ἢ *μάλα* πλείονα προσδοκῶν ἀπ' αὐτῶν *δυναμένων δικαίως* ἐπιφέρει τὴν νέμεσιν ἐπὶ τῶν ἐξ αὐτῶν *ἀρνούμενων* παρέχειν τὰ προσδοκώμενα; Ἐὰν προτιμᾷ ὁ Θεὸς βλασφημεῖσθ' ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, *ἀνευ* ἐλπίδος τῆς *μεγίστης δυνατῆς* τελειώσεως τῶν *πνευματικῶν* ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων, δι' ἣν *δυνάμενον* κατὰ γνώσιν Θεοῦ τὸ Βυζάντιον *οὐκ* εἰργάσθη· ἢ μάλλον *αὐτῆς* ἕνεκα τῆς ἐλπίδος καὶ δι' *ἀγάπην* ἔτι ὑπομένει τὰς βλασφημίας ἡμῶν, ἔτι παρ' ἡμῶν ἀναμένων ὅπως κάπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν *τῶν ἥδη τιμωρηθεισῶν* διδασκόμενοι χωρίσωμεν ἐπὶ τελειότητα; Κάπὶ τούτου γε δεῖ ὑμᾶς διδόναι *εὐθείαν καὶ κρυσταλλίνην δημοσίαν* ἀπάντησιν, τῶν πνευμάτων ἡμῶν ὁδηγητικὴν! Σημειώσατε ὅτι *οὐκ* ἐγγύτερον τοῦ Θεοῦ κἄρα προτιμώτερον εἶναι τοῦ ἡμετέρου τὸν "δυτικὸν" χριστιανισμόν διατείνομαι! Ὁ Κύριος οἶδε καὶ τὴν ἐγγύτητα! Τοῦθ' ὅμως λέγω: Ὅτι ἐὰν πως παρὰ ταῦτα, τὴν Ὁρθοδοξίαν ἀνωτέραν δοκῶμεν, ἄρα δεῖ ἡμᾶς κάπὶ τῶν περὶ τῆς "Δύσεως" πραγμάτων *τάληθ' ὅτι* λέγειν, ὥστε οὐ μόνον οἰκοδομεῖν ἡμᾶς ἑαυτούς, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀγάπῃ κάκεινους καὶ πάντας, πρῶτον μὲν διὰ τοῦ ἐγκαρδίως συγχαίρειν αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς ἅπερ ποιοῦσι *κοῦκ* ἐπιχαίρειν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐκείνων παθήμασιν, ὕστερον δὲ διὰ τοῦ εἰσάγειν *κἄς τὸν ἡμέτερον βίον* τὰ χριστιανικὰ πνευματικὰ κείνων εὐρήματα, χύστατα δέ, ἅμα *πείθοντες διὰ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ* περὶ ταῦτα πάντα ἡμετέρου φρονήματος, διὰ *τῶν ἀδελφικῶς κἄνευ ἰχνους οἰήσεως* ὑποδεικνύναι αὐτοῖς τὰς ἐντυχούσας κακοδοξίας αὐτῶν, οὐδ' ἐπὶ στιγμὴν λησμονοῦντες τὴν *μερικὴν* ἡμῶν πάντων γνώσιν τῶν Θείων πραγμάτων! Ταῦτ' ἐγὼ γὰρ σὺν Θεῷ καλῶς οἶδα: Πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι καθ' ὃ μέτρον ἢ νῦν παρατηρουμένη "δυτικὴ" ἀπιστία ὀφείлет' εἰς τὴν ἀτέλειαν τῆς ἐπὶ Θεῷ πίστεως τῆς "Δυτικῆς" Ἐκκλησίας, *ἄρα κατ' ἀνάλογον μέτρον καὶ αὐτὴ ὀφείлет' εἰς τὴν προδραμοῦσαν ἀτέλειαν τῆς προτέρας μὴ ἔτι σχισθείσης "Βυζαντινῆς"*! Ἔστι γὰρ ἱστορίας συνάφεια καὶ συνέχεια! Δεύτερον δ' ὅτι ἐάνπερ Ὁρθόδοξοι Χριστιανοὶ θέλωμεν θεωρεῖσθαι τε καὶ πιστεῦσθαι, ἄρα *κἂν* παντὶ Ὁρθοπράκτας δεῖ ἡμᾶς εἶναι *κοῦ* κακοπράκτας, ὥς ὁ ἐθνικὸς καὶ κοινωνικὸς ἡμῶν βίος ἡμᾶς καταδείκνυσι, διατεινομένους ἅμα τὸ ἀδιάσπαστον κοινωνίας, κράτους καὶ Ἐκκλησίας, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ

τὸ τῆς ἱστορικῆς ἡμῶν συνεχείας! *Οὐκ* ἀγνοῶ τὸ ὑπὸ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἐπιτελούμενον κοινωνικὸν ἔργον! Ἀλλὰ τοῦτο οὐδ' ἐπὶ στιγμὴν ἐστὶν ἱκανόν! *Οὐχ* ὡς σωμάτων μόνων θεράπεινα καὶ τμήμα τοῦ κατὰ κόσμον κράτους ἢ Ἐκκλησία κατεστάθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἢ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ μερικῶς αἶρη τῶν κοινωνικῶν φροντίδων τὸν κόπον κάπερισπάστως ἀπὸ δεινῶν ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἐπιδιδῶνται κακῶ, ἀλλ' εἰς *εὐαγγελισμόν*, τουτέστι πρῶτην θεραπείαν τοῦ *πνεύματος* τῶν ἀνθρώπων· ὅπερ αὐτὸ ὑγειαῖνον καὶ τὰ σώματα ὑστερον ὀρθῶς θεραπεύει! Ἀσφαλῶς γε καὶ σώματα ἐθεράπευσεν ὁ Χριστός! Ἀλλ' *οὐχί, ἀσφαλέστατα*, διὰ τὴν τοῦ καίσαρος κοσμικὴν ἄνεσιν! Ἀλλ' εἰς *ἀπόδειξιν μόνης* τῆς ἄνωθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἰδίας Αὐτοῦ καταβάσεως, καὶ τῆς περὶ τὰ *πνευματικά* προσοχῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων Θείας ἐπιθυμίας! Διὰ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῖς *Αὐτοῦ θαύμασι* τὴν ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν πίστιν κατέστησεν! Ἀλλὰ πόλις ἀπὸ μακροτάτων αἰῶνων εὐαγγελισμὸς τῆς *μὴ ἔτι ἐξαντληθείσης* Θείας ἐπιθυμίας ἀμφὶ τῆς ἐπὶ *πάσας πνευματικὴν τελειότητα* ἡμῶν προσοχῆς, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ μερίμνης, γίγνεται ἐν τῇ ἑλληνικῇ ὀρθοδόξῳ ἡμῶν κοινωνίᾳ; Ἄρ' ἐξηντλήθη τὸ κατὰ τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ εὐαγγέλιον, ἐν οἷς *στενοῖς* ὁρίοις Ἐκεῖνος ὠμίλησε τότε πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους *ἀδυνατοῦντας λαβεῖν στερεὰν τροφὴν πλεον τοῦ γάλακτος*; *Διατί* οὖν εἰς *μόνον* τὸ γάλα ἕως τοῦ νῦν περιοριζόμεθα; Ἦν οὖν Θεοῦ θέλημα τὸ ἐγκαταλιπεῖν τὴν ἐπὶ τελειότητα πολιτισμικὴν-πνευματικὴν πορείαν τὰρχαίου ἑλληνικοῦ κόσμου καὶ περιορίσαι πᾶσαν τὴν προσοχὴν εἰς τὰς λειτουργικὰς ἐκκλησιαστικὰς τέχνας, καθάπερ τὸ Βυζάντιον ἔπραξεν, *οὕτως ἐπεινεγκὸν παρὰ τὰ παρ' ἡμῶν εὐλαβῶς πιστευόμενα* τὸ μεσαιωνικὸν σκότος; *Διατί* προσκολλώμεν' ἐπὶ τὴν βυζαντινὴν μόνην παράδοσιν τοσούτον πεισμόνως ἀρνούμεθα τὰ πικρότατα ἡμῖν πλέον γεγεννημένα, πλὴν *ἀπὸ Θεοῦ* πρὸς ἐπιβίωσιν *ἀπαραίτητα*· μηδὲν διδασκόμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς *συνεχοῦς* καὶ *συναφοῦς* ἡμῶν ἱστορίας καὶ θεωροῦντες αὐτὰ ξένα πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέραν παράδοσιν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀποβλητέα ὡς *δῆθεν ἀπὸ δυσμῶν καταναγκαστικῶς* εἰσαγόμενα παρὰ τῶν καθ' ἡμῶν ἐπιθυμούντων κακά; Καὶ *πῶς* ἡ εὐαγγελισμένοι ἐσμὲν *ἀπὸ μακροτάτων αἰῶνων* *κακοδαιμονοῦντες* κατ' *ἀπόδειξιν ἱστορίας*; *Πῶς ἡ ἀμάθεια* καὶ ἡ οἴησις συμβαδίζουσι μετὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Χριστοῦ; Ἐτι πρεσβεύετε ὅτι τὸ Σχῆμα ἐν τέλει ἐπῆλθε δι' ἀγαθότητα πίστεως, ἢ διότι οἱ *ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἀμαθεῖς* τὴν *σφετέραν ἀμάθειαν ἀγνοοῦντες ἐπιμελῶς ἐλησμόνησαν* ὅτι *μόνον ἐπὶ μέρους γνωρίζομεν τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, καὶ μᾶλλον ἔτι ἢ ὡς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς προσεκολλήθησαν ἐπὶ *μόνην* τὴν "ποιμνίαν" νομὴν, γάλα, δέρας καὶ κρέας· ὑπὲρ ὧν *μόνων* ἐχωρίσθη ἡ *ἀδιαίρετος* Ἐκκλησία Χριστοῦ· ὑπὲρ ὧν *μόνων* ὡς καὶ διὰ δῆθεν "ἱεραρχῶν" ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἀμαθῶν εἰσῆλθε τὸ ἔτι πονηρότατα *κακουργούμενον* μίσος; Ἡ ἀληθὴς μήτηρ τῇ ψευδεὶ προσέφερε τὸ τέκνον ὀλόκληρον, δι' ὃ καὶ ἐδικαιώθη! *Πῶς οὐδὲν* δι' αὐτοῦ ἐδιδάχθησαν αἱ *χριστιανικαὶ ἐκκλησίαι*, καὶ *παρὰ τοῦτο* ἔτι χωρίζουσι τοὺς λαούς; Ὡς οὖν οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἡμῖν πλέον ἀρνεῖσθαι ὅτι καὶ *διὰ ταύτης τῆς διαιρέσεως* ὁ κακὸς φέρεται κατανικῶν τὸ καλόν, ἐπαιρόμενος, βλασφημῶν καὶ παντάπασιν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τυφλῶν, *πῶς ἀδρανεῖ* *κοῦ συσπειροῦται* *πᾶσα ἡ Ἐκκλησία Χριστοῦ*; Οὐκ ἀναρίθμητ' εἰσὶ νῦν οἱ παγκοσμίως ἀόκνως ἀπεργαζόμενοι τὴν ἐπὶ Θεῷ ἀπιστίαν καὶ βλασ-

φημίαν; Οὐκ ἔστι μέγα καὶ τὸ παρ' ἡμῖν πλῆθος τῶν ἀόκνως ὑπὸ δῆθεν χριστιανικὸν μανδύαν ἀπεργαζομένων τὸν τελικὸν τοῦ τόπου τούτου ἀφανισμόν, τῶν ποινηρότατα στρεβλούντων, πρὸ ἀμαθῶν οὖς πρὸς μείζον' ἀμάθειαν σύρουσι, τὴν ἀλήθειαν περὶ τῆς "Δύσεως", ἣν *ἀσιγήτως* μισοῦσι διὰ τὴν ἐπιτυχίαν αὐτῆς, ἣν *ἀσέμνως* χλευάζουσι διὰ τὰς ἀποτυχίας αὐτῆς, ἥς τὰς πληγὰς σώματός τε καὶ πνεύματος *οὐδόλως*, εἴτε ὡς Χριστιανοὶ εἴτε ὡς ἄθεοι πλὴν "φιλάνθρωποι", θεραπεύουσι· διαβιούντες ὡς *ἄσωτοι* πλὴν ἀπ' αὐτῆς τὰ κατασπαταλόμενα δανειζόμενοι, κοῦδ' ἐπὶ στιγμὴν ἀναλογιζόμενοι πῶς τάχιστα ἐπιστρέφειν αὐτῇ τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς δάνεια ἵνα καὶ τὴ δυννηθῇ διαθρέφαι τοὺς ἰδίους πτωχοὺς; *Πῶς παντάπασιν ἀπαθῆς* παραμένει ἡ ἐν Ἑλλάδι Ὁρθόδοξος Ἐκκλησία Χριστοῦ πρὸ τῶν κατὰ τῆς "Δύσεως" *ἀσιγήτων* ψευδῶν; Αὐτοκρατορικὴ οὖν καὶ τῶν λαῶν ἐκμεταλλευτικὴ ἔστιν ἡ "Δύσις"; Ὁρᾶτε τίνες οἱ λέγοντες! Μὴν οὐκ εἰσιν οἱ *ὀπίσω*, πρὸς τὸ *Βυζάντιον* βλέποντες κάκεινου νοσταλγοῦντες τὴν αὐτοκρατορικὴν δόξαν, πλὴν *διὰ μόνην τὴν οἴησιν* οὐδ' ἐπὶ στιγμὴν οἱ ἀμαθεῖς ἀναλογιζόμενοι τὴν παρὰ τῶν Βυζαντινῶν *ἄσωτον κατασπατάλησιν* τῆς ἥς ἀναξίους αὐτῆς κληρονόμους ἑαυτοὺς κατεδείξαντο Ῥωμαϊκῆς αὐτοκρατορίας; Ἀληθῶς, τίνες τὴν μάθησιν καὶ παιδείαν καὶ χριστιανισμόν ἐσκόρπισαν τοῖς λαοῖς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ; Ἐπεὶ οἱ ἀνατολικοί, οἵτινες δι' *ἀμάθειαν μόνην ἀνέστειλαν τὴν τελείωσιν τοῦ πολιτισμοῦ ἐφ'* οὐ καὶ *προΐσταντο, περιεφρόνησαν τὰς "θύραθεν" ἐπιστήμας, κατέκαυσαν τὰς ἀρχαίας βιβλιοθήκας, ἀκαδημίας, ναοὺς, παρέδωκαν εἰς τὴν βρῶσιν τοὺς ἀρχαίους παπύρους* πλὴν ὅσων ἰδιωτικῶς διεσώθησαν, *διεχώρησαν τοὺς Ἕλληνας εἰς ἀμοιβαίως μισουμένους ἐγγραμματάτους καὶ ἀγγραμμάτους, κἂν τέλει παρήγαγον ἐν αὐτοῖς ὡς καὶ τὸ γλωσσικὸν πρόβλημα, ὡς καὶ τὸ ἔτι διατηρούμενον τοῦ λαοῦ μῖσος κατὰ τῶν γραμμάτων, διακαῶς ἐπιποθοῦντος μὲν τὰ "διπλώματα" ἀλλ' ὅμως δὲ οὐ διὰ τὴν ἀγάπην τῆς γνώσεως ἀλλὰ τῆς κοινωνικῆς προβολῆς καὶ τῆς διὰ χρημάτων ἀνέσεως, ἢ μᾶλλον οἱ δυτικοὶ χριστιανοί;* Τίνες ἐκ τοῦ πλεονάσματος τῆς σκληροτάτης αὐτῶν ἐργασίας καὶ οἰκονομήσεως πλούτου ἔτι διατρέφουσι καθ' ὃ μέτρον δύνανται τοὺς πεινῶντας καὶ διδόναι ἐργασίαν τοῖς πτωχοτάτοις ἀνέργοις μακράν, ὡς καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ νῦν τοῦ παρὰ τῶν τὴν "Δύσιν" ἀσιγήτως μισούντων κατασυκοφαντουμένου οἰκονομικοῦ οἰκουμεισμοῦ; Ἐπεὶ οἱ ἀνατολικοί, ἢ μᾶλλον οἱ δυτικοὶ χριστιανοί; Τίνες κατὰ τὰ τελευτάα εἴκοσιν ἔτη τοσοῦτο χρῆμα παρέδωκαν καὶ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, ὅπερ κατασπαταληθὲν παρ' ἡμῶν εἰς οὐδὲν μέχρι τοῦδε ἀπέβη, τῆς πνευματικῆς καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἡγεσίας τοῦ τόπου *ἀπολύτως ἔτι σιγούσης* πρὸς τῆς βλασφημοτάτης ταύτης κραιπάλης καὶ ἀσωτείας, δημιουργησάσης καὶ τὰ νῦν ἅλута ζέοντα τοῦ τόπου προβλήματα· ἅτιν' αὐτοδιαφθαρέντες δι' *ἀπεργιῶν* μόνων, τουτέστι δι' ἔτι ἡσσοῦ προσπαθείας, δῆθεν *"ἀγωνιζόμεθα" λῦσαι, οὐχὶ διὰ διπλασιασμοῦ ἐργασίας καὶ κόπου* καὶ τοῦ τιμίως δι' αὐτῶν κτωμένου καὶ ἀποταμιευομένου ὑλικοῦ πλούτου; Ἐστὶ χριστιανικώτερον τὸ διδόναι ἐλεημοσύνην, ἢ μᾶλλον *παραγωγικὴν οὐ κατ' ὄνομα* ἐργασίαν; Ἐστὶ χριστιανικώτερον καὶ κοινωνικώτερον καὶ Ὁρθόδοξον τὸ *ἀρνεῖσθαι* τὴν κοπιώδη παραγωγικὴν καὶ πόρων οἰκονομικὴν ἐργασίαν· τὸ *θηρεῖν* μισθὸν ἀλλ' οὐκ εἰς ἀνταπόδοσιν ἔργου· τὸ *ἀρνεῖσθαι* μείωσιν

μισθῶν ἵνα πάντες μισθῶνται καὶ τρέφονται ἐργαζόμενοι καὶ ἔξῃσιν ἔργον ἐν ἐποχαῖς ἰσχυρῶν ἀγελάδων, ἀφ' ὧν μόνον οὕτως ἐξελυσόμεθα· τὸ μισεῖν τοὺς ἐπιμένοντας παρέχειν μισθοὺς ἀντὶ ἔργων διότι μόνον οὕτω προάγεται ὁ πολιτισμός, οὗς διὰ τὴν ἡμῶν ὀκνηρίαν ἀναγκάζομεν μεταφέρειν εἰς πτωχοτέρους λαοὺς τιμιώτερον τοῦ ἡμετέρου προσφέροντας ἔργον τὰ ἐργοστάσια παραγωγῆς ἀγαθῶν· τὸ στασιάζειν καὶ δηρὸν ξένας ἰδιοκτησίας ἐπ' ὀνόματι τῆς "κοινωνικότητος"· ἢ πολὺ μᾶλλον τὰ τούτων πάντων ἄκρως ἀντίθετα; Διότι ἐὰν καὶ περὶ ταῦτα πάντ' ἀναλογίζεσθαι οὐκ ἀναγκασθῶσιν οἱ νῦν Ἕλληνες [ἄκρως διαφθαρέντες ὑπὸ τῶν δημαγωγῶν, πολιτικῶν καὶ δῆθεν "πνευματικῶν", εἰς τὸ θεωρεῖν "θυσίας" δῆθεν γεγενημένας τὴν μείωσιν αὐξήσεως τῶν πρὸς αὐτοὺς παροχῶν ἐξ ἀσώτων δανείων, τῶν δανειστῶν ἐνώπιον τῆς ἡμετέρας κραιπάλης ὀρθῶς ἀριουμένων] ἔτι μείζονα παρέχειν ἡμῖν δάνεια, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μισουμένων παρ' ἡμῶν τῶν ἀγνωμόνων, τῶν δημαγωγῶν πρὸς ἄλλα μάλα μείζονα ψεύδη καταδηγωγούντων χῶς ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς ἔθος χῖν' ἀποσείσωσι τὰς αὐτῶν κολοσσιαίας εὐθύνας] παρά τινος ὡς νῦν ὑμεῖς δυναμένου ἀπαιτεῖν καὶ ἐπιβαλεῖν τὴν γενικὴν προσοχὴν καὶ σιγὴν, τῆς πρὸ ἡμῶν νέας χιλιετίας δυσσιώπως ἀνατελλούσης τοῦ κακοῦ μὴ ἀνατρεπομένου· καὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν οὐ κάμψωσι μετανοοῦντες καὶ κλαίοντες, τότε μὴν ἀπατᾶσθε ὅτι ὑπάρξει ἐλπίς τις σωτηρίας ψυχῶν, ἢ τοῦ δυσκλεοῦς τούτου τόπου! Ἀσφαλῶς δικαιούνται οἱ νῦν Ἕλληνες (ὡς καὶ πάντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι) ὑπερήφανοι εἶναι! Ἀλλὰ πῶς οὐ σὺν Θεῷ; Πῶς ὑπὲρ μέτρον; Πῶς ἄνευ τινὸς ἰδίας ἐκάστου αὐτῶν συμβολῆς εἰς τὴν ἐπαύξεισιν σὺν Θεῷ τοῦ παγκοσμίου πολιτισμοῦ; Ἀσφαλέστατα οὖν οὐ διὰ τοὺς προγόνους, ὧν τοὺς τάφους οὐ σέβονται· οὐδὲ διὰ τὴν πίστιν, ἧς τὰς εὐθύνας ὑπερορῶσιν! Οὐ διότι πρῶτος καὶ δὴ πρὸς κατεύθυνσιν ἀγνωστοῖν ἐκκινῶν ὁ δρομεὺς στεφανοῦται· ἀλλὰ διότι ἐφ' ὃν προῦρισται δρόμον δραμῶν ἐφ' ὃ ὡσαύτως προῦρισται τέλος πρῶτος αὐτὸς τερματίζει! Οὐδ' αὐτὸ νῦν κατανοοῦμεν, Ἕλληνες καὶ Χριστιανοὶ ὄντες; Πόσοι καλῶς νῦν καὶ τὸν δρόμον καὶ τὸ Τέλος γινώσκουσι;

Χοῦτω, πρῶτον μὲν τοῦτο: Ὅτι ἄδικόν ἐστι, κᾶρα οὐ σὺν Χριστῷ, τὸ κατηγορεῖν τὴν Ῥωμαιοκαθολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν διὰ τὸ συναναμείγνυσθαι τῷ κόσμῳ, ὅστις γε δι' αὐτὴν οὐ τοσοῦτον ὡς ἡμεῖς, ἵνα δίκαιοι ὦμεν, ἐν περιπτώμασι νῦν κυλινδοῦται! Δεύτερον δὲ τοῦτο: Ὅτι καθόπερ ἀκριβῶς μέτρον χυμῆς ἐπιχειρεῖτε λόγον καὶ περὶ τὰ δῆθεν "κοσμικὰ" ἔχειν, ἄρα κατὰ τοῦτο χυμῆς καταφαίνεσθε "Πάπας"! Ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀδίκως, ἐγῶμαι, ἂν δι' αὐτῶν κατορθώσητε καὶ περὶ τὰ καιριώτατα καθαρῶς πνευματικὰ τοῦ παρόντος αἰῶνος καθοδηγεῖν πάντα τὸν λαὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὐ δὲ μόνον τὸν ἐν Ἑλλάδι! Θερμῶς παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς ὅπως μὴ δειλιᾶτε! Παγκόσμιον ἀληθῶς ἐστὶ τὸ ἀκροατήριον· οὐ μόνον ἐξ Ἑλλήνων ἢ Ὁρθοδόξων! Οὐδεὶς πλέον τόπος ἐστὶν ἐπαρχία! Ἀποβάλετε οὖν τὸ ἐπαρχιωτικὸν πνεῦμα, δι' ὃ κατατρύχονται μειονεκτοῦντες οἱ ἐν Ἑλλάδι δημόσιοι ἄνδρες! Ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου σήμερον διεξάγεται πᾶς λόγος! Ἀλλωστε, ὡς πάντες τοῦ Θεοῦ τέκνα ἐσμέν, ἄρα πάντα τὰ τέκν' Αὐτοῦ δεῖ καταφθάνειν καὶ τὸν δι' ὑμῶν μεστὸν Αὐτοῦ Λόγον! Ἀσφαλῶς, ὡς δι' ἀγάπην τὰς βλασφημίας ἡμῶν ἐπὶ δισχιλιετίαν ἔτι ὑπομένει τὸ Πανάγιον Πνεῦμα, ἄρα οὐκ ἀπέλιπεν ἡ ἐλπίς ὅτι

πλείονες ἡμῶν ἐπανακάμψουσι πρὸς τὸν Κύριον! Καὶ ἡ Ὁρθόδοξος ἡ κρείττων ὄντως ἡ πίστις, χοὶ Ἕλληνες ὧσιν οἱ κρείττονες ταύτης διδάσκαλοι, ἄρα ἐφ' *ὕμᾱς πρῶτον* νῦν ἐπιπίπτει ἡ κυρία εὐθύνη πρὸς τὸν Κύριον ἀγαγεῖν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, Ἕλληνας τε καὶ μὴ, *πάντας!* Διὰ τοῦτο προέχει τὸ *ἐν τάχει πλὴν καλῶς* διορθῶσαι τὰ στενώτατα τῆς Ἐκκλησίας προβλήματα, ὥστ' ἀπερίσπαστον ἀποδοῦναι ὑμᾶς αὐτὸν εἰς τὰ εὐαγγελικά, ὡς ἀδιάσπαστα κἀν μιᾷ πνοῇ οὕτως εἰπεῖν νῦν ταῦτα παρουσίαζονται πρὸ ὑμῶν καὶ πάντων ἡμῶν εἰς τὴν ὡς ἄνω μακροτάτην παράγραφον.

Ἐπιτρέψατέ μοι συνεχίσει ἐπὶ τινα ἔτι χρόνον. Οὐδεμία πλέον ὑπάρχει ἀμφιβολία: Τὰ μάλα οἱ δυσσεβεῖς ἐπικράνθησαν ἐπὶ τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ ἀναρρήσει! Σαφεστάτη ἐστὶν αὐτῶν ἡ ἀμηχανία οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ προσπάθεια ὅλως ἀποφυγεῖν συζητῆσαι πάνθ' ἅπερ διὰ τοῦ λόγου ὑμῶν ἐθήκατε πρὸ πάντων ἡμῶν! Ἀλλὰ καὶ σαφεστάτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἄδολος ἀγάπη μεθ' ἧς ὁ λαός, ἰδίως μετὰ τὰ περὶ τῆς συγγνώμης *πρωτάκουστά τε χῶλως ξένα ὥσὶ δυσσεβέσιν*, ὑμᾶς περιέβαλλε συναισθανόμενος τὸ μέγα χρέος πάντων ἡμῶν ἀμαρτανόντων πρὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τῶν ἰδίων ἡμῶν τέκνων! Μέγα οὖν οὕτω κεφάλαιον κατεθήκατε, ἐφ' ᾧ νῦν οἰκοδομεῖν ὑμᾶς δεῖ! Ὡσαύτως ἀναμφιβόλως, οἱ δυσσεβεῖς ἐπικράνθησαν διότι οἱ γέροντες ἱεράρχαι ὑμᾶς ἐξελέξαντο, μόνον ἀναμφιβόλως μεταξὺ αὐτῶν πάντων δυνάμενον τοιοῦτον λόγον ἀρθρῶσαι, ὑπὸ τὸ βάρος τῆς μεθ' ὑμῶν συμεριζομένης εὐθύνης, δοθείσης καὶ τῆς προβεβηκυίας αὐτῶν ἡλικίας! Δεινὸν τὸ ἀκοῦειν διὰ στόματος τοῦ προκαθημένου τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, τουτέστιν ἐκ μέρους *πάσης* τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, αἵτησιν συγγνώμης ἀπὸ τῶν τρυφερωτάτων αὐτῆς τέκνων! Οἱ δυσσεβεῖς ἐπικράνθησαν διότι ἀρνηθέντες μετανοεῖν καὶ μερίζεσθαι τὴν ταύτης ἀνάγκην δημοσίως ἐταπεινώθησαν καὶ γυμνῇ κατεφάνη τοῖς πᾶσι τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν ἡ κενότης! Οὕτω, λαμπρὰν κατέλιπεν ὑμῖν τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι χημὶν τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσι παρακαταθήκην ταπεινώσεως πρὸ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν ὁ μακαριστὸς Σεραφεῖμ· εἰς τέλος παραμείνας πηγαίως ταπεινός, ἐπὶ γῆς αἰεὶ ἔχων τοὺς πόδας, μηδέποτε ἐπὶ καλάμου ἀναβάς ὑψιπετῶν καὶ τοὺς "ὑπηκόους" ἀποξενῶν διὰ τοῦ "ἡμεῖς"! Τὸ "ἐγώ" τοῦ Σεραφεῖμ ἦν τὸ *ταπεινὸν* ἐκάστου ἀνθρώπου, οὐχὶ τὸ γνωστὸν ἐγωιστικόν! Τοῦτ' ἦν ὅπερ ἀγαπητὸν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐποίησε! Κατὰ τοῦτο, ἀκολουθήσατ' αὐτῷ! Οὐ δεῖ ἀποστάσεις ἀλλ' ἀγάπην μόνην χωρεῖν μεταξὺ ἀδελφῶν ἐν τῇ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίᾳ! Ἡ καὶ κατισχύσει εἰς τέλος!

Φαντάσθητε ἑαυτὸν λέγοντα:

"Ἐπειδὴ *κι ἐγὼ πονῶ μαζί σας*, παιδιὰ μου, *γι' αὐτὸ* σᾶς παρακαλῶ, ἡ Ἐκκλησία μας ὅλη σᾶς παρακαλεῖ καὶ προσεύχεται:

Μὴ σκοτώνεσθε! Εἴμεθα πολὺ λίγοι οἱ Ἕλληνες γιὰ νὰ σκοτωνώμαστε σ' ἄδικα δυστυχήματα! Ὁ Θεὸς μᾶς ἔφτιαξε γι' *ἀνώτερα* πράγματα! Γιὰ ν' ὁμορφαίνουμε τούτη τὴν γῆ, καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ὅλη τὴν Πλάση, μ' *ἔργα ἀνώτερα* καὶ τὴν *ὁμορφὴν παρουσία* μας· περπατώντας σεμνά, σταθερὰ πάνω στὴν γῆ, ὅχι, *ποτέ*, μεθυσμένοι! Γιὰ νὰ ρουφᾷ ἡ γῆ *ἀγαλλομένη* τὸν ἰδρώτα τῆς προσπάθειάς μας πρὸς τὸν οὐρανό, καὶ μ' αὐτὸν νὰ μᾶς τρέφῃ· ὅχι νὰ πίνη *στενάζουσα* τ' ἄδικο αἷμα μας πάνω στὴ βρωμερὴν ἀσφαλτο!

Μὴν εἰσθε ἄσεμνοι! *Δέν* πρέπει στοὺς Ἕλληνες! *Δέν* πρέπει

στοὺς Χριστιανούς! Τετραπλὰ δὲν πρέπει σὲ μᾶς τοὺς Ὁρθόδοξους! Οὐτε, πολὺ δίκαια, μπορεῖ κανεὶς νὰ σέβεται τοὺς ἀσέμνους! Καὶ οἱ ξένοι πιά καταλαβαίνουν τί λέμε! Πολὺ πιὸ πολὺ σεῖς οἱ νέοι, παρὰ ἐμεῖς οἱ δεινόσαυροι, θὰ ἔχετε νὰ κάνετε μ' ὅλο τὸν κόσμο, ἀπὸ τὸν ὁποῖο *μόνο δίκαια* μπορεῖτε ν' ἀποσπάσετε τὸν *δίκαιο* σεβασμό! Γιὰ νὰ τιμήσετε καὶ ὠφελήσετε πρῶτ' ἀπ' ὅλα σᾶς τοὺς ἴδιους, *μὴ* συμπεριφέρεσθε ἄσεμνα! Καὶ περήφανα γυρίστε τὴν πλάτη σ' ὅσους τὸ κάνουν!

Μὴ ρυπαίνετε τὴν πατρίδα! Σπαρμένα παντοῦ εἶναι τὰ κόκκαλα καὶ οἱ τάφοι! Κάθε σπιθαμὴ τούτης τῆς γῆς ἔχει ποτίσει τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὸ αἷμα! Ποὺ χύθηκε γιὰ νὰ δώσῃ καὶ σὲ μᾶς καὶ σὲ σᾶς τὴν ἐλευθερία, μαζὶ καὶ τὸ ὄνομα! Βεβηλώσαμε τὴν πατρίδα, παιδιὰ μου, μὲ τοὺς ρύπους καὶ τὴν ἀσχήμια! Ἀπὸ καθαρὴ τεμπελιὰ καὶ τὴν ἔλλειψη τῆς πιὸ μικρῆς γενναιότητος γίναμε μὲς δυστυχῶς βάρβαροι! Σεῖς, παιδιὰ μου, γίνετε, μείνετε Ἕλληνες, ὅπως σᾶς πρέπει! *Μὴ* ρυπαίνετε τούτῃ τὴν γῆ, καὶ *δὲν ἐννοῶ μόνους τοὺς φυσικοὺς ρύπους!* *Δὲν* ὑπάρχει πέρα ἀπὸ τούτῃ τὴ γῆ τόπος πού τὸ πῶς νὰ ζῆς στὸν Παράδεισο νὰ διδάσκεται· καὶ ποτὲ ὁ Θεὸς δὲν θ' ἀναγκάσῃ κανένα μας καθαρὸς νὰ γενῇ στὸν Παράδεισο γιὰ νὰ μπῇ! Ἄνθρωπος πού τὴν Πλάση ρυπαίνει, τ' Ἅγιο τοῦ Θεοῦ Πρόσωπο ποτὲ δὲν θὰ δεῖ!

Μὴ καταστρέφετε τὴν πατρίδα, παιδιὰ μου! Πατρίδα μας πρώτη εἶναι ὁ οὐρανός, ἀλλ' αὐτὸν κανεὶς βέβηλος δὲν μπορεῖ νὰ ἐγγίση! Πατρίδα μας δεύτερη εἶναι ὅλη ἡ γῆ καὶ τοῦτος ὁ τόπος πού καλοῦμε Ἑλλάδα! Αὐτὴν ἐννοῶ νὰ μὴ καταστρέφετε! *Μὴ* καταστρέφετε τὸ χορτάρι, τὸ λουλουδί, τὸ δένδρο! *Μὴν* ἐρημώνετε τὴν γῆ πού μᾶς τρέφει καὶ μᾶς δίνει πνοή! *Μὴ* καταστρέφετε τὴν φυσικὴ πάνω στὸν οὐρανὸ γραμμὴ τοῦ βουνοῦ! *Δὲν* ἦταν ἀνθρώπου τὸ Χέρι πού τὴν ὁμορφιά της ἐχάραξε! *Μὴ* καταστρέφετε τὸν καθαρὸ τοῖχο, τὴν λαξεμένη πέτρα, τὴν στρωμένη πλάκα, κάθε δική σας καὶ ξένη περιουσία! Πολὺς εἶν' ὁ ἀνθρώπινος μόχθος πού στὴν θέση τους τᾶβαλε! Ὅλα εἶναι δικά σας, ἀκόμη κι ὅταν δὲν εἶναι δικά σας! Δικά σας νὰ τὰ χαρῆτε, ἀλλ' ὄχι καὶ νὰ τ' ἀφανίσετε! Κανεὶς μας πεθαίνοντας δὲν τὰ πέρνει μαζὶ του! Σὲ σᾶς μένουν νὰ τὰ φροντίζετε, νὰ τ' αὐξήσετε, μὲ τὴν σειρὰ σας καὶ σεῖς περισσότερα ν' ἀφήσετε στὰ δικά σας παιδιὰ! Καὶ νὰ εἴσαστε γι' αὐτὰ ὅλα περήφανοι! Ὅταν συγγνώμη γιὰ τὴν γενιά μου σᾶς ζήτησα, κι ἄλλα καὶ τοῦτα καὶ τέτοια εἶχα στὸ νοῦ! Ὅτι *καταστρέψαμε* τὴν πατρίδα καὶ καλλίτερη δὲν τὴν κάναμε! Γιατὶ μᾶς ἔλλειψ' ἡ πίστη στὸν Θεό, στὴν πατρίδα, στὸν ἑαυτό μας, σὲ σᾶς! Γιατὶ *δὲν* βάλαμε τὸν νοῦ νὰ δουλέψῃ! Γιατὶ *τεμπελιάσαμε* καὶ δειλιάσαμε μπροστὰ στὴν πολλὴ δουλειὰ πού ἀπὸ *μᾶς* νὰ γίνῃ περίμενε! Γιατὶ νομίσουμε πὼς *μὴ* ἐργαζόμενοι ὅσο ἔπρεπε, θὰ φανοῦμε *τάχα* πιὸ "κύριοι" καὶ *τάχα* "ἀριστοκράτες" ἀνέγγιχτοι ἀπὸ τὸν *ἅγιο* μόχθο! Γιατὶ νομίσουμε πὼς ἡ δουλειὰ εἶναι *τάχα* ντροπὴ! Καὶ γιὰ χρόνους

μακροὺς θεωρήσαμε πὼς μὲ μόνη τὴν *χωρὶς μεγάλα* καθημερινὰ ἔργα *φλύαρη καὶ κενὴ* κυριακὴ προσευχὴ θὰ κερδίσουμε *τάχα* ὅταν ἔλθ᾽ ὁ καιρὸς τὸν Παράδεισο! Καὶ γι' αὐτὸ *καταφάγαμε* τὴν αὐτοκρατορίαν ὁλόκληρη, ποὺ γι' αὐτὸ δὲν μᾶς ἄξιζε! Γιατὶ πλημυρισμένοι ἀπὸ *μίσος* κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ποὺ *δίκαια* τὴν ἐπῆρ' ἀπὸ τὰ *μαλακά* κι *ἀδοκίμαστα* στὴν σκληρὴ δουλειὰ χέρια μας καὶ τὴν ἔδωσε στοὺς βαρβάρους γιὰ νὰ δείξη πόσο χαμηλὰ εἶχαμ' ἔτσι ξεπέσει, ἐμεῖς ὅταν *ἄλλοι* ἐλεύθερους πάλι μᾶς γέννησαν, ὅχι μόνο μυαλὸ δὲν ἐβάλαμε, ἀλλὰ συνεχίσαμ' ἀκόμη χειρότερα τὶς παλῆς ἀσωτείες *τάχα* ἐκδικούμενοι τὸν Θεό, καὶ μέχρι σήμερα ζοῦμε *μὴ* σκεπτόμενοι, *μὴ* ἐργαζόμενοι, *ἀσταμάτητα* *κενῶς* *περὶ* *κενὰ* *φλυαροῦντες* μὲ τὴν *φρούδα* ἐλπίδα ὅτι ἔτσι θὰ σταματήσουμε καὶ θὰ ξεγελάσουμε *τάχα* τὸν ἀμείλικτο χρόνο, μ' ὅλο καὶ περισσότερα δανεικά, ποὺ θὰ *πληρωθοῦν ὅπωςδῆποτε* ὅχι πιά δυστυχῶς ἀπὸ τοὺς γέρους ἐμᾶς ἀλλ' ἀπὸ *σᾶς* τὰ παιδιὰ μας, ποὺ τέτοιους δρόμους *τάχα* ὀρθοὺς ὡς τώρα διδάξαμε, καὶ συνεχίζουμε *καταγέλαστοι καὶ σ' ὅλα ἀνίκανοι καὶ παντὸς σεβασμοῦ ἀνάξιοι* γέροι καὶ *ἀεριτζῆδες αἰσχροὶ* τοῦ δημόσιου βίου, ἀντὶ δηναρίων, οὔτε κἂν ἀργυρίων, τὴν πατρίδα νὰ ξεπουλάμε καὶ περίττωμα τὸν ἀτίμητο θησαυρὸ νὰ τὸν κάνουμε! Ἐτσι διαφθαρέντες, ὅλοι μας θέλουμε τὴν διπλὴ ἀμοιβὴ νὰ κερδίζαμε τὴν μισὴ καὶ διπλὰ τσαπατσούλικη δουλειὰ καταβάλλοντας! Καὶ κανεῖς μας ποτὲ δὲν ἐρώτησ' ἀπὸ ποῦ θᾶρθουν τὰ διπλὰ ποὺ ζητᾶμε, ποιὸς θὰ κάνῃ τὴν *ὑπερδιπλὴ σωστὴ* δουλειὰ ποὺ ἀπὸ τὴν καθαρὴ τεμπελιά μας ὅλο καὶ πιὸ πίσω ξεμένει! Ἐτσι καταστρέψαμε καὶ καταστρέφουμε τὴν πατρίδα! Παιδιὰ μου, συλλογισθῆτε! Γιὰ *σᾶς* τοὺς ἴδιους πιὸ πρῶτα ἴσως κι ἀπ' αὐτὸν τὸν Θεό, σταματήστε ὅμοια τὴν πατρίδα νὰ καταστρέφετε! Θὰ τὴν πάρουν, καὶ *δίκαια, ὀριστικά*, ἀπὸ τὰ χέρια σας! Σταματήστε, *πρῶτα γιὰ σᾶς*, τὴν φωτιά καὶ τὸν ἐμπρησμό! *Μόνο* τοὺς ἑαυτοὺς σας φτωχότερους κάνετε, καὶ *πάρα πολὺ εὐτυχέστερους* τοὺς ἐχθροὺς μας! Σταματήστε πιά τὴν γενικὴ τούτη καταστροφή! *Παραγίναμε βάρβαροι!* Ποιοί; Ἐμεῖς οἱ ἐξ Ἑλλήνων!

Μὴ περιφρονεῖτε, παιδιὰ μου, τοὺς νόμους, ἀκόμα καὶ τέλειοι ὅταν δὲν εἶναι! Γιὰ νὰ γίνουμε ὅλοι τελειότεροι Ἕλληνες καὶ καλλίτεροι Χριστιανοί, γι' αὐτὸ ἔχομε καὶ τοὺς νόμους! Καὶ μόνο ὅταν ὅλοι γίνουμε τελειότεροι θὰ κάνουμε καὶ θὰ κάνετε καὶ τοὺς νόμους καλλίτερους! Βοηθήστε καὶ μᾶς, *ντροπιάζοντάς μας γι' αὐτοὺς*, γιὰ *σᾶς* καλλίτερους τοὺς νόμους τῆς πατρίδος νὰ κάνουμε! Γιατὶ *χωρὶς αὐτοὺς κανένας μας, οὔτε σεῖς οὔτ' ἐγώ*, δὲν μπορεῖ νὰ ξέρῃ *τί πρέπει*, δηλαδὴ *τί τιμᾷ* τὸν Ἕλληνα, τὸν Χριστιανό, τὸν Ὀρθόδοξο! Πιστέψτε με! *Δὲν* μοιάζουν κἂν νόμοι, ὅταν ὁ ἄνθρωπος μ' αὐτοὺς βοηθοὺς, ἀπὸ μόνος του, ἀπὸ μέσα του κατ' εὐθείαν, μαθαίνει νὰ κάνῃ ἐκεῖνο ποὺ πρέπει, γιὰ νὰ σταθῇ μὲ χαμόγελο κι ὅχι ντροπὴ μπροστὰ στὸν καθρέπτη του, καὶ νὰ κοιμηθῇ στὸ κρεβάτι του *χωρὶς τύψεις καὶ φόβο*, μ' ἐμπιστοσύνη στὸν ἑαυτό του καὶ τὸν

Θεὸν ὅτι ἔκανε τὸ καθήκον του πάνω στὴν γῆ! Ἔτσι μόνο στὴν τελειότητα φθάνοντας αὐτομάτως καταργοῦνται οἱ νόμοι! Αὐτὸ εἶναι ἡ τελεῖα ἐλευθερία! Πρὸς τὴν ὁποία τελειότητα καὶ ἐλευθερίαν ὁδεύοντας, ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἀπὸ τὸν φόβο τῆς ἀνομίας ἐλευθερώτερος γίνεται, καθὼς μὲ τοὺς νόμους ἀπὸ μόνος μαθαίνει νὰ κάνῃ ὅ,τι πρέπει σ' ἐλεύθερον ἄνθρωπον! Ὅποιος τοὺς νόμους περιφρονεῖ, ἐλεύθερος τάχα γιὰ νὰ *φανῇ*, αὐτὸς εἶναι πού καὶ τὴν σκιά του φοβάται! Μὲ τὴν ψυχὴ του γεμάτη ἀπὸ φόβο, ἐφιάλτες καὶ τῦψεις, *ποιὸς* εἶναι ἐλεύθερος; Ὅταν χρειάζεται φάρμακα καὶ ναρκωτικά καὶ πιотὸ γιὰ νὰ ξεδώσῃ ὁ νοῦς ἀπὸ κεῖνα, κι ἔτσι *ἀπὸ κάθε πιά νόημα* νὰ μείνῃ ἀπυθμένως κενός, *πῶς* ἀλήθεια ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἶν' ἐλεύθερος; *Πῶς* λοιπὸν σὰς θέλουν ἐλεύθερους, ὅσοι, γιὰ νὰ ἐκμεταλλεθοῦν τὴν ψυχὴ καὶ τὴν τσέπη σας, ποιητὰ σὰς διδάσκουν τὴν ἀσέβεια πρὸς τοὺς νόμους; Καὶ τὴν ἀνομία, πού φέρνει τὸν φόβο, πού μὲ τὴν σειρά του φέρνει τὸν ἄνθρωπο στὸν *γενικὸν ἀκαθόριστο φόβο*, τὴν ἀπουσία κάθε χαρᾶς, τῆς ὁποίας τὸ κενὸ στὴν ψυχὴ σας ἔρχοντ' οἱ ποιητοὶ νὰ γεμίσουν μὲ φάρμακα, ναρκωτικά καὶ πιотό, ὥστε μὲ σατανικὴ χαρὰ νὰ σὰς δοῦν νὰ σκοτώνεστε, ἄνθρωποι σεῖς σὰν σκυλιὰ πάνω στὴν ἀσφαλτο, ὅταν ἀκόμη καὶ γιὰ τὰ σκυλιὰ καλλίτερος πρέπει νὰ εἶναι ὁ θάνατος;

Μὴ ψεύδεσθε! Τὸ ξέρω! Εἶναι πολὺ δύσκολο πάντα νὰ λὲς τὴν ἀλήθεια! Τέτοιαν ἀλλοίμονο κάναμε τὴν ζωὴ μας, γιατί δὲν μάθα- μ' ἀλήθεια τί εἶναι νὰ εἶσαι ἐλεύθερος! Δύσκολο, ἀλλὰ ὄχι καὶ ἀκατόρθωτο γιὰ τοὺς Ἕλληνες ἢ τοὺς ἄνδρες! Πιστέψτε με! *Τίποτε* δὲν ἀνεβάζει τὸν ἄνθρωπο στὰ ἴδια του τὰ μάτια μπροστὰ στὸν καθρέπτη ὅσο ἡ ἐτοιμότης του νὰ πεθάνῃ γιὰ ὅ,τι πιστεύει πῶς πρέπει στὸν ἄνθρωπο! Καὶ μπροστὰ στὴν ἐτοιμότητα νὰ πεθάνῃ κανεὶς σὰν ἀκέραιος ἄνδρας καὶ Ἕλληνας, ἡ ἐτοιμότης τοῦ νὰ πῆς τὴν ἀλήθεια γίνεται πιά πολὺ εὐκόλη! Καὶ ἔξυπνος καὶ ἐλεύθερος ἄνθρωπος εἶν' αὐτὸς πού *ἀποφεύγει* νὰ κάνῃ ὅ,τι θὰ τὸν κάνῃ, ἂν τὸ κάνῃ, νὰ πῇ ψέματα! Ἡ γνώσις ὅτι ἐστάθηκε σὰν ἄνδρας εὐθύς, ὀρθὸς μπροστὰ στὴν ἀλήθεια, ὦ, πόσο ἐλαφρὰ τὸν κάνει νὰ πατᾷ πάνω στὴν γῆ, καὶ νὰ νοιώθῃ ψηλὸς τρία μέτρα, ὅταν ὁ ψεύτης σὰν σκουλίκι σιχαμερὸ σέρνεται πάνω στὴν γῆ! Οὔτε σὰν φτερὸ στὸ σπαθί σας μὴ σηκώνετε πιά τὸ ψέμα! Γι' αὐτὸ κι ὁ Θεὸς συγχωρεῖ τὸν ὀρθὸν ἄνδρα καὶ βδελύσσεται τὸν κάμπτοντα τὴν ὄσφιν καὶ συνρόμενον εἰς τὰ ψέματα πού τὸν πνίγουν! Ζῆτε, παιδιὰ, κατ' ἀλήθειαν καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια θὰ σὰς ἐλευθερώσῃ καὶ θὰ σὰς κρατήσῃ ἐλεύθερους! Ἔτσι θὰ μπορέσετε ν' ἀπαιτήσετε κι ἀπὸ τὴν δική μου γε- νιά, πού κατέστρεψε μὲ τὰ ψέματα τὴν πατρίδα, καὶ *χωρὶς νὰ ρω- τήσῃ* σὰς, τὰ παιδιὰ της, τὴν ἐφόρτωσε μὲ τὰ χρέη πού *σὰς* στ' ἀλήθεια καλεῖ νὰ πληρώσετε, νὰ σὰς ποῦμε ἐπὶ τέλους τ' ἀληθινά, ὅλα κεῖνα πού καίνε! Ἔτσι μόνο θὰ μπορέσετε νὰ περιφρονήσετε κάθε ψεύτη, δάσκαλο, καθηγητὴ, ἀρχηγό, πολιτικό, ποιητὴ, ἢ καὶ παπᾶ, πού ἔκανε τὸ ψέμα ἐπάγγελμα! Γιατὶ *σεῖς*, πρέπει νὰ ξέρε-

τε, θὰ πληρώσετε κείνων τὰ ψέματα! Διώξτε τους τους ἀνάξιους μακρὰ σας!

Σταθῆτε, νὰ σὰς χαρῶ, ὁμορφοί, τέλειοι, ὅπως πρέπει στοὺς Ἕλληνες, πανύψηλες φωτοβόλες ὀρθές ἀκέραιες στῦλες τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου Θεοῦ μπροστὰ στὸ σκοτάδι ποὺ ἀπλώνεται γύρω σας! Δικός σας θὰ γίνη ὁ κόσμος ξανά, ὅταν χρέος τῆς τελειότητος κάνετε τὸν σκοπὸ σας, ποὺ ἐμεῖς οἱ γέροι φοβηθήκαμε ν' ἀτενίσουμε μὴ πιστεύοντας στὸν Θεό, ἀλλ' οὔτε καὶ στὸν ἑαυτὸ μας· καὶ γι' αὐτὸ ξεχάσαμε κάθε τέλειο μέτρο καὶ σὰς διδάξαμε τὴν σιχαμερὴ μετριότητα καὶ τὴν αἰσχρὴ μας τσαπατσουλιά, γιὰτὶ μετρηθήκαμε καὶ βρεθήκαμε κι ἀπὸ τὸ μέτριο πρὸ κάτω πολὺ!

Δὲν φθάνει, παιδιὰ μου, ἀπλὴ συγγνώμη ὁ ἄνθρωπος νὰ ζητῇ! Πρέπει νὰ ξέρῃ καὶ νὰ λήῃ γιὰτὶ τὴν ζητεῖ, ὥστε καὶ νὰ διδάσκῃ καὶ νὰ διδάσκεται, γιὰ νὰ μὴ ξανακάνῃ καὶ μὴ ξαναγίνουιν στὴν πατρίδα τὰ ἴδια, κι ἀποστρέψει ξανά καὶ ὀριστικὰ πρὸς ἀπὸ μᾶς τὰ βουρκωμέν' ἅγια μάτια Τοῦ ὁ Θεός!"

Τίς μετὰ ταῦτα τολμήσει λέγειν ὑμῖν ὅτι ὑπερέβητε τὰ "κοινῶς παραδεκτὰ" ὅρια; Ἔστι τις *συγχρονιώτερος* ἠθικὸς λόγος πρὸς τοὺς νέους καὶ πάντας ἀπευθυνόμενος ταῦτα καὶ τοιαῦτα μὴ λέγων; Ἀλλὰ καὶ τίς συγχρονιώτερός ἐστι λόγος, ὡς καὶ *πολιτικῶς* πρέπει, ἵν' ἀπὸ τοῦ τέλους ἐπὶ τέλους ἐκφύγῃ ὁ τόπος; Ἀλλὰ καὶ τίς ἐπαναστατικώτερος τούτου ἔσεται λόγος, δυναμιτίζων τὸ τέλμα, κάποστέλλον ἀπὸ τοῦ φωτὸς τῆς διασημότητος πάντας τοὺς ἀνικάνους, δυσσεβεῖς, πονηροὺς καὶ κενούς; Φοβεῖσθε ὅτι ἐὰν οὕτως αὐτοὺς καταγγείλῃτε, δυνηθήσονται ἔστω ἕνα καθ' ὑμῶν καὶ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας λόγον ἀρθρῶσαι; Ἡ ὅτι παραμενοῦσιν ἐπ' ἐξουσίαν, περιφρονούμενοι; Τίς "πολιτικὸς" τολμήσει δις τὴν ἐπαρχίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπισκεψέσθαι, ἀπαξ περιφρονηθεῖς, ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν πολιτῶν διδαχθέντων, διὰ *δυσσεβείαν πίστεως καὶ πατρίδος*; Ὁ τόπος ἡμῶν ἀποπνίγεται διότι *οὐδεὶς ἀπ' ἁμβωνος ἀκούεται σύγχρονος λόγος* περὶ ἁμαρτίας! Ὡς εἰσιν ἁμαρτίαι ἰδιωτικά, ὁμοίως εἰσὶ καὶ δημόσιαι! Τίς τολμᾷ λέγειν ὅτι μόν' αἱ πρῶται ἴστανται ὑπὸ τὴν ἀρχιεπισκοπικὴν ῥάβδον· ὅτι αἱ δευτέραι ἐξαιροῦνται; Πόσους ἐκάστοτε ζημιοὶ ἐκάστη ἰδιωτικὴ ἁμαρτία; Ἐνα, δύο, τρεῖς; Πάντως *ὀλίγους*! Πόσους ἐκάστοτε ζημιοὶ ἐκάστη *δημοσία* ἁμαρτία; *Πῶς μείονας τοῦ ἔθνους παντός*; Ἐὰν ἡ δημοσία ὑπερπερισεύσασα ἁμαρτία οὐ καταστηλιτευθῇ, ἴασιν τῶν τῆς πατρίδος πληγῶν οὐχ ὑπάρξει! *Τοῦτ'* ἐστὶ τὸ μέγα ἐφ' ὑμῶν ἀποτεθὲν τοῦ Σταυροῦ βάρος! Ὅτι οὕτω κατανοεῖτε αὐτό, πάντες οἱ *εὐφρεῖς* κατενόησαν! Ὡς ἀσφαλῶς παρ' οὐδενὸς ἀσημοτέρου ζητήσετε φέρειν αὐτό, πάντες *ἐναγωνίως* οἱ *εὐφρεῖς* ἀναμένουσιν ἰδεῖν πῶς ἐπ' ἀρίστα ὑμεῖς ὑψώσετε τὸν δημόσιον *σταυρικὸν* λόγον: οἱ μὲν εὐσεβεῖς *ἐλπίζοντες* ὅτι ἤδη ὁ Κύριος ἐχαλύβδωσε τὸ πνεῦμα ὑμῶν, οἱ δὲ δυσσεβεῖς *φόβῳ δεινῷ συνεχόμενοι* ὅτι ἐλήλυθεν ἐπὶ τέλους ἡ ὥρα τῆς γεύσεως τῆς ἀρχιεπισκοπικῆς ῥάβδου!

Ὁ ἀναστὰς Κύριος ἔστω ἀεὶ μεθ' ὑμῶν,

ΑΠΟΚΡΙΣΙΣ: Οὐδεμία.

Re: LETTER TO DR. CHARLES HARPER

Mr. Charles Harper, Exec. Dir. & VP,
JOHN MARKS TEMPLETON FOUNDATION
P.O.Box 563
Howell, NJ 07731
USA

July 29 / October 2, 1998.

**The Fundamental Problems of Rapprochement of
Science and Religion**

[This is an enlarged version, not sent but re-worked up until October 2, 1998,
of a letter originally sent on July 29, 1998]

Dear Dr. Harper:

A good American friend of mine, aware of my lifelong avocational interest, has sent me the June 30, 1998 New York Times article "Science and Religion: Bridging the Great Divide", where both your own and the Foundation names were mentioned. Without the slightest doubt, your objective *is* most important! The following, ***being only a part of my own findings*** [for a brief biographical note on me please look at the end], will certainly be of interest and, I trust, of help.

THE BEGINNING AND CAUSE OF SEPARATION

Although science began drifting clearly away from religion some centuries ago, *it would be very wrong* to regard this as the beginning of the story! The *true* separation of the two branches *was in fact canonized* at the trial of Socrates! *He* was the first to attempt bringing *Unified Reason, ever since "demonized"*, into the picture of *all* our intellectual pursuits! It was *not* for nothing that the priesthood of his day *stood with his accusers* (the poets, professionals, politicians, orators) and *not* on his side, the *false* accusation against him being the introduction of "new gods"! Because, *all* holders of (*unexamined*) cherished beliefs, those

foundations of our habits, held religiously even when irreligious, and those that scrape their living off them, sense imminent danger in the face of the dispassionate pursuit of Unified Reason, that most aristocratic (in the ancient true sense) of all human pursuits, held in awe by those who demagogically are led to regard best what meets with the greatest, even if ignorant, public approval, rather than the test of Unified Reason itself! Alas, not even the ancient Greeks learned unforgettably their lesson from the trial and condemnation of Socrates! When, centuries later (in the historically first age of universalization of culture, but at the level of least, not greatest, common denominator!), St. Paul declared the non-existence (but only for the possession of soul by all) of any difference between Greek and barbarian and was misunderstood by the unlearned and unwilling to learn (i.e., improve their own souls) masses, and (I should say) ignorantly, or else deliberately, by those that led them, the way was thus opened to literally destroying the ancient Greek Culture and ushering in the medieval Dark Ages, the rich sorry consequences of which we still harvest! Indeed, the separation of science and religion in recent times followed the reawakening in the human consciousness only of "Reason" (i.e., what is left when Reason is not Unified!), with which we only began exiting the Dark Ages! Indeed, is it not true that there is still no dispassionate recognition by all of the commanding hold on Reality of Unified Reason? Indeed, are we not much closer to the spirit of the Dark Ages refusing to recognize Unified Reason as the Truth Itself that shall set us free? Living now the historically second universalization of culture, in order to avoid yet another, and even worse than that first, turn toward deeper darkness, we must see to it that we finally find the courage to examine critically all our present cherished beliefs! Otherwise, the future does not bode well! As we now, overwhelmed by both History and Fact, determine the future of mankind, we shall be unforgivable if we do anything less, letting ourselves be drawn into it by inertia and ill founded "optimism", simply by "believing" in what we know not, having lost all clarity of Unified Reasoned Faith, and by "reasoning" in a way that Unified Reason rejects! Unquestionably, the "reasons" for their stance of each of the two branches are mere excuses unworthy of intellectuals, unable to stand close examination! Please consider:

THE "BELIEVERS'" FAILURE OF FAITH IN GOD

First as regards the "believers" in God: Do they *all* believe it more reasonable that God be One or Many? If Many, *what indeed is it that persuades them all to common action?* Unified Reason? If so, *that One stands above them all, who therefore are not Gods!* No Unified Reason? *How then one of them imposes his will upon the rest; all of whom, being Gods, are therefore unswayable from their own separate opinions?* No Unified Reason and no one to impose *his* will upon the rest of them? *How then is there Law and Harmony in the world (an*

irremovable hard fact of Reality, that *alone* supports the scientific pursuit, and for which *alone* the world has been called “cosmos”) and *not* utter meaningless and thus *hopeless* chaos (that, *if true*, shows the scientists *mere charlatans*)? Thus, that *there are still* “believers” in *many* Gods *irrefutably points to the fact* that *they are not reasonable* before the naked hard facts of Reality! But also to the *fact* that the “believers” in One God have *not yet* found it in their power, wisdom, or even “faith” (even in the face of the *threatening widespread unbelief* in *any* God or Gods!) to persuade those others to *abandon* their polytheism, so that they all together present a *unified* front against ravenous atheism! Therefore, as the *present* “belief” in one (many) God(s) *ignores the irremovable facts* of Reality and *lacks the power to move* this “mountain”, it *cannot* be *true* Belief! The *present* “belief” in God thus *profanes* God and *dishonors* its holders!: Please do *not* be shocked, but consider:

As even the Holy Scriptures were *not* written by the hand of God but *only of man and for his use*, they *necessarily* were written in *his inexact and, even, faulty* language that *alone* he could hope to understand, *not in God’s own, that is foreign to man and beyond his* understanding! The claims of “theologians” to *all extent contrary* to this *hard fact* of Reality is a *conscious hidden and, therefore, malicious* attempt to pass on to God *man’s own (i.e., the “theologian’s” primary) failure and continuing unwillingness* (led by *laziness and unbelief!*) to understand and express the Holy Things better, that *continue to be expressed in now frozen anciently unclear and progressively ever more incomprehensible words*, as if God’s wisdom *had thus been exhausted in, and could not have been made available to us in clearer than in those definitely unclear vehicles! Even the studied professional mannerisms, even the hardly concealed naked threats*, of “theologians” should *not* intimidate us in our search after Truth! *All* that is imperfect and even *flatly false* in the Scriptures is due *solely to man, not to God!* It does *not* help the situation that, for fear of undoing the whole structure, the “theologians” *refuge* to thresh chaff from grain in order to make progressively clearer what we know *only in part, for long centuries preferring* to stick to the *unclear* words rather than to what ought to have been their *clear to all God-intended* meaning, thus reducing the Unifiedly Reasoned Faith of Man in God to *mere superstition* of people *unable to understand*, reduced to *sheep and chattel*, “flocking” to churches as those women (and *all* like them) so characteristically chastised by St. Paul!

In the Judeo-Christian tradition there have been *two* basic statements, to the significance of which *both* professional “theologians” *and* the rest of us (*all* “theologians”, each in his own fashion!) remain to this day mostly oblivious!: “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth” and “In the beginning was the *Logos*”. What then *truly was* in the beginning? God *or* Logos? I.e., God *without* Logos, or a *Logical* God *fully capable of infinite Logical* reasoning? Is

there *any* doubt that the Jewish tradition, as testified by the *entire* Old Testament, has *never* spoken of a *Logical* God, but only of a *willful* God? Is there *any* doubt that the Christian Church *has not yet found it* in her “infinite” wisdom to include in the Creed a *clear* statement to the *indisputable fact* of God being the *Logos* (and the *Person*), when *clearly*, *any obscurity on this most cardinal matter, for casting doubt about the Logicality (and Personhood) of God, is the unforgivable sin?*

The *indisputably religious* wars *continue* to this sorry day in Northern Ireland, the Balkans, the Middle East, elsewhere. Mixed with blood, naked hatred rolls down the streets, while *not one* of the great religious leaders orders *his own followers to stop fighting under explicit threat of immediate excommunication!* Surely, *if I truly believe* in God, I *must* believe Him *able to deal directly* with those who disbelieve in Him! Therefore, *that He chooses not to vanquish them as I fervently desire ought long since to have persuaded me to keep my hands well short of them!* What *religious* sanction can any religious war then have? *How*, then, can it be impolite or disrespectful to state, *in deepest pain*, that the *present unbelief* in God *has indeed sprung from within*, and *is fanned* by the *religious* Judeo-Christian tradition (*including its Moslem branch*), that, *continuing to remain consciously foreign* to the Greek Culture (*not to be confused, as it has been* by “Christians” and others, with the *popular* ancient Greek culture), has *not* spoken of the *only One possible*, the *Logical* God?

Can there be any doubt that the “Great Divide” *shall never be bridged except solely with Unified Reason*, since it is there solely for *His absence* from our “reasoning”? How feasible is then the bridging, when the present “believers” show so *little* capacity for Reasoning Unifiedly, as is indisputably shown by their *approval* of their own religious leaders’ *always malicious*, especially when most studiously hidden, bickering with others—about their differences, their dioceses, their *naked* efforts to extend them and increase their own take from them *even by war*, their spiritual and *other* “rights” over “their flocks”, whom (in order that they keep them under their own tight control!) they *systematically poison* against the believers of other denominations and faiths with pills coated carefully with the *fictitious* sugar of *apparent* love? Which all they do, *in conscious violation* of Christ’s clearest commandment, *not* for the major Glory of God, but most definitely *only for their own* greater “respect” (read, *fear rather than love*) among men?: Just please consider *how little mention* of God Almighty, the *Logos Himself* is made today by “theologians” “discussing” *so-called* “theological” matters! When these people show so *little* Reason present in their “reasoning”, expended over *cheap pseudo-religious power politics*, *not* over *high* Theology, *what* indeed can possibly fill their souls, other than *naked* sentiment—a *dangerous* counsel?

THE NON-BELIEVERS' FAILURE OF FAITH IN REASON

Now as regards the *unbelievers* in God: They are divided into those that reject belief in God for *philological, not philosophical*, “reasons” and those that do so for so-called “scientific reasons”. As to the first, their opinion is *utterly questionable if not altogether valueless*, as they *indeed refuse* to subject their “reasoning” to testing in the *present* light of the *hard facts* of Reality (the significance of which they *usually keep willfully beyond* their comprehension) and *only reproduce* (rather in order to show off their erudition) “arguments” from centuries *past*! However true it is that “philosophy lags ever farther behind the *present* scientific findings”, it *should not escape any truly modern* intellect that one *may no longer utter definitive statements* about the cosmos and God without the *strictest Logical* examination of *all the basic hard facts* of Reality, that are *not necessarily* what the philosophers (or even scientists) of the *past* regarded as unalterably true! *All past* philosophy that *cannot* stand the *strictest present* tests reduces at best to *history* of philosophy, at worst to *mere philology*, the *meaningless talk about careless talk rather than hard fact*!

As to the second group of unbelievers, and here we come to the true opposition, it boggles the *trained objective* mind to see them, *all to the last man, committed not to the most carefully conceived objective and dispassionate Logical* search after Truth, that, *as such, welcomes the finding whatever it be*, but to *such methodical bending of the manner* of “search” as it *best guarantees the desired “finding”*, that *alone* guides their search! In this light, only as a *poor* joke can their insistence be taken that *their* method alone is “logical”! Others too can play the *logical* game, and, indeed, to *devastating* effect! Look!: There is a *vast* difference between *dispassionately examining nature itself* to see how it is built, and *deliberately adopting hypotheses and inventing theories* with the *clear though unstated* objective in mind to *guide* the “search” in such ways as to “find” the world “built” *as desired*! *Despite* their method, there can be *no* doubt that *they too* search even if only to “find” how the world *is built*! But if *built*, and *however built*, the world *must now be taken as a completed engineered project*! Which means that *only by reverse engineering* may at all the *exact* manner of its building be revealed, *not by willfully preconceived hypothesis or theory, or experiment based on such*! Which proves *redundant* the *prior* construction of hypotheses and theories! The archeologist forms *no* theories as to how the foundation was laid out of the *still buried* ancient temple, before he begins searching, in order to “guide” his search! He *simply begins most carefully scraping and dusting off* the layers of soil! I suggest, the modern *theoretical “cosmologists”* do *not* demonstrate the *required respect* for the project laid down billions of years ago! They simply *put on airs*, assured by the fact that, alas, *no theoretician has ever gone to prison for a failed theory*! The engineers have *no* such luxury! *They respect the hard facts*! *Don’t* be shocked! A *failed*

theory that *willfully* is *not* abandoned *is far more dangerous even to life* than an, usually limited, engineering project! At worst, a falling bridge kills the *few* that happen to be on it and under it! *How many have been killed* by the theory of the “Just War” or the one behind the Inquisition? *How many could be killed* if the modern “scientific” view that gravitational and centrifugal forces are only “fictitious” *were* taken literally? *Have* the theoreticians a *grounded* sense of Reality?

It is *not literally* true, as is usually said, that we need theories to guide our experiments! Indeed, *we must see to it that this not be* the perfect method assuring that an “unwelcome” finding is *never* unearthed!

—Watt did *not* need an hypothesis or theory of energy before conducting his experiments on heat! The *subsequent engineering* finding that “energy is neither reduced to, nor made up from, nothing”, *may not* as a first thermodynamic (i.e., *engineering, limited by the experiment*) law be assumed to lie at the foundation of the structure of the natural world! Even in the form of $E = mc^2$, the *showing* of the *constancy* of *both* m and c , or of the *proportionality* of $m \sim c^{-2}$ is *necessary before* stating the constancy of E ! Modern “science”, *far from showing either*, uses the “first law” as a *quasi-religious doctrine of eternity* of matter and energy!

—Newton did *not* have a *theory* of gravitation to show him his way to measuring the *hard fact* of gravitation!

—*Breaking with tradition*, Einstein, *not* a recondite experimentalist but an *abstract* theoretician, built his special relativity theory on the *dubious assumption* of *constant velocity* of light, and was *so much* overjoyed to “find agreement” with the Fitzgerald “explanation” of the Michelson-Morley experiment that he did *not* re-examine either its underlying *assumptions* or the compatibility with them of his own findings! Had he done so, he *would have found the still accepted analysis of that experiment totally false, and its correct analysis not to support the “finding” of his special theory*! He then “found” Newton’s law of gravitation “somewhat inexact”, *without examining* the validity of the *tacit assumptions* included in stating Newton’s law; and *specifically* whether the *assumption* of separation between the attracting bodies measured along the Euclidean straight line *is truly operative* in nature! *Only if that occurs* does the planetary orbit lack precession! If the separation is *longer* than the Euclidean straight line, the orbit *will precess in the direction observed by an amount determined by the operative separation*! Leverrier’s astronomical finding of orbital precession did *not* invalidate the law, that guides even our rockets to the planets! *Only that assumption*! [So, *what* are we to conclude? That Einstein did *not* know what he was doing, or that he *needed* a theory of “relativity”? *Which of these two* does his memory better honor? His 1916 paper on general relativity makes *crystal clear* his *deepest* care for the *psychological effect* rather than the *logical structure* of his theory! Are we then wrong to conclude that his relativistic efforts

were not undertaken for a purely scientific, but at least also for a psychological, reason? Which? But that of “finding” *all* points of view “correct”, that alone could “justify” both his Jewish tradition and the “Christian” milieu in which he lived! But did he stop, *checked by both those traditions*, to examine the *deep theological* effect of his theory? When you insist that the world is made up on such and such mathematical laws, you do not restrict under those laws *and* their inexorable outcome *just only the humans, but also the maker of the world, whoever he may be!* Do you insist that the mathematical law is such that there is *no objective* way to decide what is where and what happens when? *Then in fact you mean that no one, not even the maker is able to decide!* How then did he *construct* the world? Did Einstein think that a *good* engineer can proceed with a project without knowing it *in full*? *Why are the theoreticians so oblivious of the hard needs* of engineering? Even if the world were self-made, the need of *full* self-knowledge *would not thereby be eliminated!* The fact that Einstein did *not* believe in the *Personal Spiritual* God of Judeo-Christian tradition is too well known to need further elaboration! Now seen is how *lame* he conceived even the “god”, the universe itself, in “whom” alone he believed!: The presence of law in it *demonstrates at least the corresponding amount* of self-knowledge! So indeed, it is an *illogical* world that is self-knowledgeable enough to be self-built on a “law” (i.e., *relativity*) that *forbids precise knowledge* of what is where when within itself! Therefore, the *expectation* (on which they labor) of modern “scientists” to “show definitively” the world such as can be *under such a theory cannot do them honor!* Even as a mere *expectation!* Let alone the *hard fact* that the world *shows itself in full knowledge (after a fashion) of how it is built*, or else, *our hard findings in it would not be hard!* It boggles the mind to see the modern “scientists” believing the world *constrained by both* the relativistic *and* the quantum-mechanical indeterminacies, when their own *delicate brains (not their minds, according to them!)*, of which they are so very proud, *are hard set to their task* and do *not* miss a jot in connecting *day after day* the string of *determined* thought that works *purposefully* to “show” the world *determinately* “indeterminate” and *indeterminately* “determined”! *How* is it that they do *not* see or hear the gargantuan irony laughing at them so *screamingly from within the very tissue* of their own super brains? Can their *malice, that dangerous sentiment, be so dead set against Unified Reason and themselves as so* to blind them? When the so-called “Christians” desire a “dialogue” with the “scientists”, do they at least have *some* appreciation of how modern “science” was built and what *deep* theological message it carries *built within itself?* And now that we are here, let us *not* fail to ask that other terrible question: *How* is it that the *healthy reasonable majority* of our society *trusts such il(l willed)logicians* to carry the torch of knowledge, and *accords them such high honors?*]

—Balmer discovered his law of spectral lines *without* benefit of the quantum

theory! But are the spectral lines *truly explained* by the original Bohr, or even the current, quantum theory, when *the logical gaps in them both are so horrendous*? Even the *look itself* of the *unexplained* origination of the principal optical spectral lines (i.e., *why the particular ones and not some others of about equal energy within the range of principal energies*) drawn on energy-level diagrams on the basis of the current theory for such as the neutral sodium or mercury atoms is unquestionably *much too messy* to permit the thought of the theory being *naturally elegant and correct*!

What I mean is that *the hard facts of nature and Reality do have a way of making themselves plainly known long before and regardless of the development of a(n elaborate) theory—provided, of course, that somebody sees them correctly!* Their *correct evaluation and final understanding* is a totally *other* matter, that, as is already being made clear and the sequel will further show, *cannot* be had by the rapprochement of what we *currently* know as “science” and “religion”! **Any “understanding” developed between them *cannot* be better than the internal misunderstandings of them both, and the compromises they may make in their desire to “understand” each other!** I, for one, *cannot* see how *any such effort can have some real value—unless it first delves in the deepest strata of them both*, which is why I am so categorical in this letter! And I trust the Foundation you lead has *no inferior* appreciation of this truth! For this reason, allow me to state, you *ought not* to expect a *true* rapprochement between Science and Religion before *each clarifies its own internal Logical inconsistencies about the basics!*:

OBLIGATORY PRINCIPLES OF REASONED THEOLOGY

All we “theologians”, *both professional and amateur, both religious and irreligious, must at long last understand* that we have an obligation to come out *crystal clear* on the fundamentals: If God exists, *certain things necessarily follow!* If He does *not* exist, *other certain things necessarily follow!* That the *same* things should follow regardless of whether He exists or not *is contrary* to Logic! Because, His being and His not being are *not* equivalent, and *cannot* have the *same* effect! *This is inexorable!* If God exists, we may “love”, or “respect”, or even *fear* Him, much as we already do; some of us more, some less; but *not* without the *appropriate* cost! *This also is inexorable!* For in the opposite case, the principle of Absolute Divine Justice *would be violated!* If God exists, *He is not worthy of our total respect unless He be no other than Logos, who alone leaves absolutely nothing out of consideration!* Because, *this is part of Absolute Divine Justice!* If anyone should disagree, he *must* give us a *solid Theo-Logical* definition of God separate from Logos! Believers in God *must understand* that *such* is the Nature of God *worth* our *total* Belief! And unbelievers in God and other atheists *must understand* that *such* is the God Whom they

must show nonexistent! We grant them all inferior so-called “Gods”! Next comes this other issue: We *must tell once for all* whether the God-Logos *in whom we say we believe* is according to our belief material or immaterial! *It is not honorable to remain noncommittal on this basic matter of faith!* If material, in order that He be principal, He *cannot* be other than the *material universe itself*, He *cannot* be a *later* “spiritual” emanation (i.e., *product*) of it! Then ***necessarily***, it is *in the large scale of it, not in our minds*, that we *must find everything needed* to command Logically the world! If we do not find Logos in the large of the physical world, but *continue to have good reasons based on the evidence* to believe in His existence, *we must declare it loudly* that Logos is *immaterial, Spiritual, categorically* [in the Kantian sense] *other than* the physical world! ***We, for being ἄνθρωποι, can only think logically, for our intrinsic obligation, on what we see!*** And we *do see* that, as we have *not always* been around and do *not* command the world so God *does not* act in the world principally through our minds! He has an existence of His own, *totally independent of our minds!* *Knowing from our personal experience* that we would *not* be persons were it not for our own Logos and that it is our own Logos that *alone* makes us *persons*, finding Logos out there, *we must declare it loudly* that *corresponding to Logos there is a Person that alone carries Him*; intoning that we *don’t* do so for thinking after our own image, but because we recognize the Person-Logos as the ***very highest category of being*** that we are at all able to conceive! We *must* be thorough: If we find Logos *physically* in the physical universe, then we *must also declare it a Person!* *If we do not find Logos physically in the physical universe*, but *continue*, I repeat, *to have good reasons based on the evidence* to believe in His existence, *we must declare it loudly* that He is a *Spiritual Person categorically outside* the physical universe and *all* notions of space, time and matter we have developed based on our knowledge of the physical world! *Only thus*, we *must* recognize, is He (the “God” of our traditional evaluation) a *He*, a *Real Objective Living Pure Personal Logical Spirit*, in short, *the True God!* Then *necessarily*, unless we *also show* the physical world to have an *infinite* past age, *we must declare it loudly* that, the world has been there *only after He purposefully put it there, producing it out of nothing prior worldly, by its produced presence there demonstrating Himself to have within Himself the power thus to produce the world under Logical Law, for a Reason, a Logical Expectation!* In this case, we *must declare* the *Logical Law a Spiritual Law fully conceived in the mind of God and only thereafter applied to the world*, that came into being *with the Law operative in it from the beginning* [for otherwise, *it must be in the Law when the Law changed later—a needless complication, unless we also show an objective need for it in Reality!*] In this case, the *Logical Expectation* also *must* be declared *spiritual, categorically beyond this world!*: As we know of *no lesser artist who includes, or can include, the purpose of his art in the article*

itself of his art, *that would then be totally useless to all but itself*, and as we have no lesser example of such a feat, we may *not* say of the *Logical God*, *categorically different* from this world, that He has installed *His Logical Expectation* from this world irretrievably in it, *to share inseparably of its fate*, but *instead* that this entire world is a *tool* to attaining *that* spiritual objective! There are *deep* Theological and Anthropological doctrines hidden in this statement of intent! Let me here state only these two: (a) As *none of us much lesser* scientists ever built a laboratory from which he *permanently shut himself out*, so too it is *not* permitted of us to regard it as beyond Logic and the power of the Maker of the world, Pure Spirit though He is, to appear in the world, *as He chooses, if He so chooses!* And (b), as Spirit is *other* than matter and *prior* to matter, to *all* extent that we too *are* spirits, *to that extent we too are other* than the matter of our bodies! Consider the *inexorable logically significant order* of the statements here made and of those that follow! *No Religion and no Science, doing honor to themselves, may be built on lesser than these Logical foundations!*

The Theologians will only be worthy of *this* lofty name, if they make it absolutely clear that in *absolutely no regard as to goodness* do they conceive God imperfect! Of this, there are Logical consequences!: Whenever we are faced with a choice bearing *directly or indirectly* on the goodness of God, *we must always choose what shows the goodness of God greater still!* *Unquestionably*, this has *not* been the manner in which we historically have conceived, let alone *acted on*, things before us! *Unquestionably*, as our civilization has advanced from *below*, so indeed has *our* understanding of the question of God! We *cannot* avoid it: there *comes* a point in the development of human minds and ideas at which the growing spirit *ceases to be autistic!* Beyond this point, a spiritually healthy human places things in the order of their *absolute* value! In that order, he finds himself *not* to possess the first and only place, in which the autistic creature permanently sees itself! Those who insist on seeing God in anthropomorphic terms, as a figment of our own imagination, quite simply have *not* outgrown the stage of their autistic evaluation of the world around them, and thus *cannot, or refuse to*, order things on a scale of absolute value! We are *not* just what we *appear* to be—what we appear, that is, to scientific instruments, a mere accumulation of mindless particles that “somehow” [the *clumsiest* pseudo-scientific cop out that has ever been] has grown *consciousness, and conscience* [of which *no one* speaks] *on top of consciousness!* We are *more* than that, and for *that* reason do we conceive God in the way we do, Perfect in *all* measure of goodness, *beyond every* “anthropomorphic” conception! The term *anthropos* (ἄνθρωπος) has a meaning *categorically other than* that which the atheist biologists give to it, having *appropriated* it! It does *not* mean “the material bipedal creature”! For the exact definition of the term, they are well advised to refer to Plato! And out of respect for him, to comprehend once for all its *purely spiritu-*

al meaning, *given* above! To believe ourselves to be what we *appear* to be, and *not* to delve into that “somehow”, *this is* the sure mark of the autistic stage! Rather, we are what we are, *because God, being the Unbegun First Pure Logical Spirit, has seen His way to making us complete, of a categorically other, double but not permanent (for the fact of death) ἀνθρωπίνην-human order*, by putting into us, apparent accumulations of physical particles, an *also created but imperishable Spirit similar to, not identical with, His own*! As His Spirit (i.e., indivisibly Himself), is *categorically separate from and prior and foreign to matter*, so too our Spirit is *categorically separate from and foreign to the humus* of our *physical* being! It is by *that Spirit alone* that we understand the world as we *indeed allow ourselves* to understand it: whether autistically, or as *grown and continuing to grow spiritual entities*! We *must* understand all these, and the Theologians worthy of the name *must* make it absolutely clear that *only in relation to this understanding of Reality* do *they and all believers in God* put their *personal dignity, intellectual honesty and total value as intellectuals* in line! Unquestionably, confusing or compromising *at all (no matter what, and however “pious”, the “excuse”)* the Spirit with matter *denigrates and profanes its absolute ontological holiness*! For the general ignorance of centuries past, even great Theologians, otherwise worthy of this name, have *not* been circumspect enough of this *categorical* difference! That especially under the pressure of current “science” there has resulted *near-total* neglect and confusion of matters spiritual, and that we now observe sorrowfully the “theologians” of the day *mute* on these crucial matters and filling their time with *trivia*, these too have *not* been sudden developments, but are wholly due to the age-long near-total neglect of Logic by “Theology”! A believer in God may *only* succeed in his efforts if he places *his* God in the *very highest pedestal he knows*! Then, if a *still higher* perception of God is made known to Him, he *must* regard it as *his inalienable intellectual duty* as a believer in *this* higher perception to regard his God!

I insist emphatically on the above because *it is fundamental to any serious discussion with the atheist “scientists”*. However little the “theologians” may like it, *it must at long last be made clear* that, it has been our *imperfect* “theological” understanding of the question of God and the abuses it has allowed over time that has brought about *all* unbelief! If the believers are at all serious, it is on the basis of the *above or better* understanding of God that they *must* conduct the discussion! Otherwise, they only deceive themselves! And, *surely*, they shall do *even worse* if they continue to *pretend* (even if “pious”) ignorance of these most pressing matters! And however little the atheists may like it, *it is clear* that, they face *not* some *easy to dismiss* “so-called God of foolish theologians”, but *the God-Logos*! If, hating the term “theologian” for themselves *whether amateur or irreligious*, they insist on separating God from Logos, *they must tell us first how they define each separate from the other, and then why they reject Him*! If

they tell us that neither exists, and so (“cleverly”) that they do not have to define what does not exist, *they must tell us for what good reason they waste their minds, the most valuable universal resource in extremely short supply, and so not theirs to waste as they please*, on trying to prove nonexistent what *they say* does not exist! Because, without Logos, *no theoretical project can ever have content!* Because, without Logos, *even their minds are nonexistent!* So *what exactly do they use* on trying to “prove nonexistent” *both God and Logos?* Because, without Logos, *how exactly will they persuade themselves and us* that they have succeeded in their endeavors? Don’t they realize that *because science is a social activity in which they put in only the brains, while we the rest all the cost, we have every right to demand succinct answers? How dare they spend our wealth, also in short supply, on such utterly foolish, though so-called “scientific”, activities?*

CRITIQUE AND REASONED REFOUNDING OF MODERN SCIENCE

Since 1974, I am in the happy-unhappy position to have made a series of discoveries that I formally brought to the attention of “science” in 1985—*only to see myself deliberately ignored without ever shown my error, if indeed I erred! As for their nature I cannot but regard these discoveries to be of the very highest significance as the sequel will show, I declare this to be the most insidious and invidious suppression of hard facts ever to have taken place in the realm of Science!*

I have asked myself whether the theory of relativity has provided a *good* way of presenting the *hard facts* of nature, and have found it *sorrowfully short* of expectation! So, I have found myself surprised that *people in high academic places, knowing the facts, do not have the intellectual and moral courage publicly to declare the theory utterly unfit for building upon it our understanding of the world!* It cannot but be significant for the intrinsic value of the theory that, based on it, *even Einstein himself till his death was unable, as has since been everyone else*, to decide whether the universe is *spatially* finite or infinite! Do we all not spend *fully one half of our lives by night?* Why have we learned *so little* from it, even those best regarded amongst us? That blackness *beyond the seen universe*, does it not indeed speak volumes? At least, Newtonian gravitation *could* by its own lights have stated that, having acted upon the universe for untold eons, it *is* finally bringing the whole thing together; and we see the blackness beyond because gravitation *empties the beyond* at it pulls the universe together! Indeed, until Hubble (*without any help* from relativity) produced his findings in 1929, *this alone ought to have been the only line of thought based on indisputable observation!* But *nobody* understood well enough either Newtonian gravitation or the blackness to make the argument! And because *not even Einstein understood the all too clear message*, either in 1916 or even till his

death, he did *not* make his theory *state clearly ought* on the matter! When Friedman in 1922 produced the solution of the general relativistic equations that allowed expansion under certain assumptions (*not shown to hold* in Reality), of all people, Einstein was the one most surprised! He *so* wanted relativity (*but for the reasons already stated*) that, he did **not design it** to cover either the *hard fact* of the darkness beyond, or explicitly the *totally serendipitous* Friedman finding! The 1916 paper stands *irrefutable witness*! Not only did Einstein *want* the *psychological support* of relativity, but unbelieving in a Spirit-Logos-God and believing only in the *believed eternal* universe-god, *he could not stomach* the idea of it-him suffering the indignity either of vanishing in the unfathomable black emptiness, or of collapsing upon himself and suffering the terrible heat-death of self-brought hell! [Still, he was *not* a nihilist, *as demonstrably are all those other atheists that simply do not care one way or the other, and rather like the idea of an indefinitely yet meaninglessly pulsating universe!*] So, to *this day*, what do we officially have? The *indisputable* blackness beyond! Newtonian gravitation that *pulls the masses together*! The Hubble expansion that *hurtles the starry* [only?] *structures radially outwards against the pull of gravity*! The theory of relativity that can be bent to “produce” *practically anything*, but *definitively* says *absolutely nothing*! The question of finitude or infinitude of the universe *undecided*! And, oh yes, we *also* have much respected *avowed atheist* professors that, in the face of the nightly glory, *are at our expense playing the costly games* of black holes *unseen* by night or day and of (super)strings that *cannot tie a knot*, by making *unverifiable assumptions in order to “see” them*! Do you seriously think that such people can, or are willing to, decide *honestly* the *greatest of all questions* placed before man, which is the question of God?

But do take Newton’s law as the professors have *not* taken it, and lo! It reveals that the *universal* Newtonian gravitational constant G is proportional to $(DT^2)^{-1}$! Not to *any or some* mass density D and time T , but to the *average mass density in, and the age of, the universe*! [Otherwise, there would be *not one but two* universal gravitational constants: the one found in Newton’s law of gravity, the other dependent on the universal D and T ; and the universe *would have to choose, unerringly in each case*, which to apply where, *or be inextricably confused*! Which is seen to be a *logically unnecessary complication unless there is a need for it in Reality*! But Reality is *what Logos made it to be*!: Simple, uncomplicated, unconfused! ***This is the only working assumption worth making!*** *It alone justifies the great labor and expense of the scientific pursuit!*] Examination of the options open under the law in conjunction with the *hard facts* out there *does show this our only material universe to have truly constant both its total mass M and its Newtonian G !* The *hard facts* show that $D = (6\pi GT^2)^{-1}$! Which, for an age of 12 billion years (corresponding to the so-called “Hubble time” of 18 billion years), produces a *present average* mass density of 5.25×10^{-30}

gcm^{-3} ! *Coincidence?* [Note that this expression, *found directly from Newton's law*, is formally identical to that of the deSitter solution of the equations of general relativity, that applies *only* to a universe of *vanishingly small mass, expanding with an ever increasing velocity*; and thus *not* to ours! *The entire conception and structure of relativity theory is such that it can neither identify its d and t with the present universal quantities of average mass density and age, nor produce anything definite for this or any universe!*]

Modern science has *not* tested and *does not know how* to test the *assumption* of the constancy over time of the velocity of light, to see whether or not it is in *logical* agreement with Newtonian gravitation! [It “simply” but *inexcusably* *assumes* that the photons are *massless*; while it does *not* deny that *light is real energy* and *energy is undefined without mass*! Which together *do* make the photons *to have real mass in proportion to their energy and closely associated with it, as every other body*! (Or else, the energy of the photon would be *here* while its mass would be *there*—a situation physically as intolerable as truly is the relativistic notion of “virtual”, *not real*, mass corresponding to the energy of the photon!) Which in turn explains *exactly*, let it be said in passing, why real particles *are measured, not simply “appearing”, to have their masses increased while*, and by amounts proportional to the energies expended in, accelerating them to “near” the velocity of light—so *not* thanks to relativity!] Under constant G and M , Newton's law demands that the universe, having the radius $R = (9GMT^2/2)^{1/3}$, *expand* with the velocity $c = (4GM/3T)^{1/3}$, *no other than the velocity of light, retarded by universal gravitation*! That, for the age of 12 billion years, produces the value of $M = 1.15 \times 10^{56}$ g! *Another coincidence?* If the theory of relativity is, as claimed, more accurate than Newton's law, *why has it so utterly failed* to produce either these expressions, or these arithmetic findings even to a “first approximation”, *despite Einstein's great labor on transforming general relativity to a theory of gravitation* (for which he had to make at least five additional assumptions, *not one on them verified* to hold in nature)? But look on: Though relativity *appropriated* the Hubble finding, *it did not also take its inexorable concomitant*, that the observed outward motion *points back to the point in space and time where all momentum vectors summed up to zero*, the point in space and time of the *creation* of the universe, *that establishes an absolute reference in both space and time and conclusively overthrows* the very precept of relativity that there is no such reference! *All* the above relationships, *derived directly from Newton's law*, show the *structural significance* for the universe of the Hubble expansion, *entirely beyond* what relativity *cannot* show for itself! But there is more!: As the remotest now observable quasars are billions of light years away from that point of origin, it *obviously took them some earlier billions of years to arrive where they are now observed*! Therefore, the age of the universe *is necessarily the sum of the time of arrival from the center of ex-*

*pansion at its observed site of every (and the remotest) object ever to be observable and the time of travel of light from that site back to us at our (present) site of observation! Modern “science” totally oblivious of these hard facts [that, I repeat, it suppresses since 1985!] has the intellectually unforgivable temerity to state that we now “know” what happened a mere thousandth of a second after the “big bang”! That the first light will forever travel radially outwards from the point of the “big bang”, and that the universe does in fact extend to the ever expanding front of its first light, way beyond any ever observable most distant object [and it is clear that we cannot see from behind or sideways the present or any past front of the universe, because light, also subject to the law of conservation of instantaneous momentum, cannot send us back light; or else, the forward moving part of it would have to increase its velocity to a superluminal value, and change its direction if the backward transmission were other than radial], are additional hard facts that “science” has, not curiously, avoided discussing! As it also has the fate of outward moving light in the case of a “re-collapsing” universe, that darling of the atheists! As it also has the initial velocity of expansion needed to overcome the infinite gravitational field of the universal mass concentrated in the beginning in a single point! It is seen at once, at the very moment the question is posited, that no finite initial velocity of expansion could have overcome the infinite initial field! The universe would have re-collapsed in no time, unless its initial velocity of expansion were itself infinite! As it was, demonstrably by its present size, and the above law of velocity! Because the temporal constancy of the velocity of light is crucial to special relativity, that “needed” first step to the general relativistic view of the world, modern “science” cannot but suppress the above law of the velocity of light coming so powerfully, so directly, so logically from deep inside Newton’s law to tie together the universe, definitively for all its future, into a true uni-verse under a Law that is not man-made! On every matter on which the truth of the hard facts is against the theory of relativity [as is the aforementioned re-analysis of the Michelson-Morley experiment, also presented to “science” in 1985], and on every matter on which the theory is utterly mute in pursuing its hidden objectives, **modern “science” and its committed atheist servants now stand against the Truth, which they suppress!** How gloriously the hard facts come together under, and are clarified based solely on, Newton’s law, while the professors are playing their games of black holes and (super)strings, is now brought to full view!*

The current quantum theory, *replete with inconsistencies, denies* the existence of so-called hidden variables entering a law controlling the electronic structure of all, and entities within, the atoms! Yet, this has *not* prevented the “scientists” from developing such theories as *they* regard “legitimate”, about “quarks”, “strings” etc., i.e., theories that support the *hidden atheistic* objectives of the whole effort! If you find this excessive, please consider: (a) Starting with

Heisenberg, it has been said in all tones of emphasis that in regard to the microcosm we “*must not*” look for the *objective* reality (even of such things as *electrons*) beyond the mathematical expressions the quantum mechanics present to us for it! First: Is it just the *mathematical expressions* in the minds or books of the quantum mechanics that “somehow” discharged on turning the switch *kill* the condemned in the electric chair, or some *real hard things* that are sent through his body? Can it be that the good professors have not considered the question? Second: Do all the bona fide theists that hope for a rapprochement with *such* a “science” think that God devised the *real hard world out there* from *mere* mathematical expressions, or rather from *real hard things obeying exact laws*? When you stand on your bathroom balance, do you weigh your *real body* or *rather the mere mathematical expressions* that, “scientists” hope, will one day “explain” the world without reference to anything *real, exact and ontologically separate* from their own *mathematical imaginations and imaginings*? Do the theists believe that God created *real, exact and objective* entities *physically present out there*, or rather *unreal, inexact and subjective pseudo-entities* present *only* in our minds as mere mathematical expressions having *no* physical substance? And do they believe that the things we see and touch, whether directly or through the tools of science, *are truly out there*, or rather *only deep inside our imaginations*? Which one of these two options supports the *Logical* belief in the *absolute* goodness of God? How can it be that *only we are real but the world around us that supports us, and of which our bodies are parts, is not*? Is this science or mere madness? Having *failed* to object to this “science”-madness, what sort of “faith” in God do the *learned* theists believe they have? (b) Do the “believers” in God *and* modern “science” really hold *such a low* opinion of God as to think Him *capable* of establishing an *exact constant* (i.e., *a for all time fully determined*) *measure of indeterminacy*(!), as the “scientists” regard the Planck constant, that henceforth renders *even Him incapable of fully knowing* what He Himself created at *all lower (and so, at all) levels*? Does/can an engineer build a car engine without knowing how exactly to build, leaving undetermined, the crankshaft? Now that Newton’s *natural* law of gravitation reveals *determined all that happened since the beginning*, there was an earliest period of time when *the action of the entire universe was less than the present value* of the Planck constant [action *increases* with the $\frac{1}{3}$ -power of the age of the universe]! *How did* anything then take place *at all*, and *how* were the laws established *at the physical level*, if the Planck “constant” is truly *constant*? (c) Has it not struck you as *most odd* that this “constant”, having dimensions of *action*, should be the measure of *indeterminacy*, as modern “science” insists, rather than *be the least action possible* in nature, that *truly saves all physical structures from immediate destruction*—as would be the case in the absence of *just such a least action* law? Indeed, *what could* prevent *any reaction at all* from proceeding (and thus

producing a *permanent* sea of *loosely, if at all jointed, most fundamental* particles), if the action involved in it *were* zero? Modern “science” has yet to recognize within its purview the ***absolute significance of the need, and the factual existence, of just such protecting law out there!*** It *crosses* the “forbidden” bounds of ***purposefulness***, whose mere mention sends absolute terror rushing down the spines of atheists!

Moreover, the law that controls the electronic structure of *all* atoms, whose existence modern “scientists” *deny*, ***has been found*** [and *was presented* to them in 1985]! The great mistake of quantum mechanics (from which *all* its logical problems have sprung) has been to regard the electron in the atom as a *tiny* body “orbiting” *indeterminately* around the nucleus rather than as a *shell of specific thickness and atomic size* [in the case of the outermost electron] *surrounding completely* the nucleus! This second and *correct* view produces a *vastly simplified, complete and determined* picture of the atom: its electrons are arranged as shells around the nucleus and vibrating *in unison* while keeping empty areas between them! As an electron gains or loses a “quantum of energy”, it jumps to an *adjacent partially overlapping shell of space*! This eliminates *completely* both the current notion of the electron physically vanishing here and materializing there “explained away” (in effect, *shrouded* from view) by the principle of indeterminacy and *all* problems associated with the size of the atom driven to ionization! It *also avoids* the *theoretical* introduction of whole multiples of the Planck constant! Now, it is the *spectra themselves*, those *hard facts out there*, that *prove the existence of the natural sequence of cardinal numbers in the natural law of the determined geometrical electronic structure of all atoms*! As the detailed presentation of the findings is rather lengthy, suffice it here to state that, *no* conceivable question regarding the electronic structure of the atom at any energy level is beyond answering *from within the principles of the geometry*! *Without recourse to forced adjustment of parameters* (as notoriously performed by Hylleraas on *no fewer than fourteen* in the *simple* case of helium) *or illogicality*! *Such geometrically determined detail is simply impossible and unthinkable* under the current quantum theory, but *fully in the spirit of the Greek belief* that, αὖτὲ ὁ Θεὸς ὁ Μέγας γεωμετρεῖ (always does God the Great geometrize)!

THE NEMESIS, THE CRIME, THE CHALLENGE

As the *entire* sort of “reasoning” modern “science” uses *is thus shown to be incorrect and illogical*, how is it at all offensive rather than *factual* to call it *only* “science” and *deny* it the name of *real* Science? The great “successes” of “science” must *not* intimidate us! “Science” *had* been “successful” before: But the Ptolemaic system of epicycles *collapsed* by the *simple* transfer of center! Modern “science” did *not* get the hint, and *failed* to be double careful! Nature then proved more intelligent than man’s intricate theory! *So does now—to a far*

more devastating effect! When we construct intricate theories to “explain” Nature, because we *thus tacitly* impugn it *incapable* of simplicity, we play with *disaster!*: For, by thinking the world more complicated than it *has to be for its purpose*, we *declare ourselves cleverer than its maker, whoever he be!* Nemesis then *is* our *inevitable* just reward! The significance of the above *constructive* critique of “science” *cannot* be overemphasized! It *empties* the idea that the laws of Nature, *cunningly* called “laws of physics”, are man-made! The laws of φυσικῆς (physics) are *not* the laws of φύσεως (Nature), but only of *professors!* Nature operates *under its objective laws out there!* It is *those* laws that applied to the universe organize it as a *union, off from the fundamental Democritean atom on up!* It is *those* laws applied to the chemical atoms that recognize the *natural sequence of cardinal numbers!* Thus also *proving* that the Sciences of physics and arithmetic *are not* realms exclusive to humans, but fields *fully known first to the Mind, irrefutably and with all proper gravity thus revealed*, behind the laws out there! So, unless the company of atheist professors and fellow-travelers *present a thinking natural machine (not a figment) existing out there, self-built from the inanimate-lawless ground up, and having produced this world as the relations and hard facts presented above require*, every reasonable man shall find himself honor-bound to regard the Mind as an *inalienable* characteristic of the Pure-Spiritual Person of God, who *alone* thought up and created the real hard world out there! That the entire physical universe *fails to show itself capable* of self-thought and -production for *lacking the necessary and indispensable center and mechanism* of legislation, administration and control makes *absolutely no* difference—or rather, *the absolute* difference! ***The laws remain! And with them so does the Mind that brought them forth! And the presence of the laws proves the existence of the Logical Mind of none other than God!*** You now understand why “science”, i.e., *specific* “scientists”, Nobel laureates, most highly respected universities, research organizations, and “scientific” societies have seen fit to *suppress* these findings! [When, under cover of the First Amendment, anything at all that promises to “make a buck” or “inform” the people who “have the right to know” *is* published *without* a thought about propriety, morality or plain old decency, a certain academic reviewer *told an interested first-rank* publisher *not* to publish my first book, in which I presented the hard facts and discussed the *Source* of Law, because ‘it would create a Velikovskyy-like furor’ [*sic*]*—and the publisher cowered, obviously not* for fear of such-like furor *that would only fill his coffers were the book published*, but for the *far-reaching implications!*] ***The discovery and proof of the existence of God, and by means least suspected by the powers (of every name, color or hue) of this world, is intolerable! For it cannot leave standing any structure that stands in for Him and takes advantage of His presumed absence! All thinking to the contrary must be deemed intolerably naïve! Cunning people will***

only agree to participate in a “discussion” about, or “search” for, God *if a negative, or at least indecisive, answer is guaranteed, or can be guaranteed* by their presence!

The NY Times article that triggered this letter stated that, at the Berkeley conference ‘there was little sense of intellectual excitement, that people were coming to grips with the disturbing issue of whether there really is a God’, and that Dr. Sandage complained ‘that many speakers have been preaching to the choir... [and] there are no atheists on the program, only strict believers’! Allow me, now that all this is brought to your attention, to wonder whether even the “strict believers” at the conference had a *good* understanding of *all* the issues involved, that this exposition finally makes fully clear! As it *probably also explains why the atheists kept away!*: They *cannot but secretly rejoice at my obvious failure* to move *at least* the religious authorities, for all my (*correctly*) *assumed* efforts! *Surely, they all cunningly know how not to tempt Fate!* *Surely*, an absence of excitement would *not* have been there had the above *hard facts* been at all known to the conferees! And *surely*, the question arises as to whether *even they could have withstood that excitement!*

It is *not* difficult to see why *any* public mention of these *hard facts* [that are only *some* of the findings “science” *and* the powers behind it *suppress* since 1985] *must* usher to a *new* intellectual, ethical *and* moral era! Nor is it difficult to see why the *unshakable* proof of the existence of God *must precede* the Judgment! **The crime of the rejection of God-Logos is *never* as great as when it is knowingly committed in His Face!** The issue of the existence of God is thus disturbing to *many more people and in many more ways (including the determination to commit this ultimate crime and to have it committed by the greatest possible number of people—since nothing is more diabolical than just that)* than those *not* stated in the NY Times article! The current “light” is *convenient* to both “believers” *and* nonbelievers; *high priests and high scientists!* As things now stand, they *all* have a *free* rein; and they reign over the world as best each can! ***With God proven, all that must come to an end, or the crime shall be, as now is being, maximized!*** So, indeed, the *terrible* question arises whether the various attempts to bring “Science” and “Religion” together *truly* aspire to establishing the Logos-God’s Justice, or *only* aim at putting a *final gloss over the current reign of general licentiousness, enjoyed by free-wheelers all over, especially following the now absolute general doctrine of total relativity, that expelled from our spirits the absolute peg of God-Logos!* Ah, to be brought before the greatest of all issues! To feel the *deep* meaning of ἀνθρωπος -human, half God and half mud, having to make the *determinate of himself* choice of eternity he prefers, *not* from the bleachers or from the fence, but from the struggling field of Hard Fact!

This exposition is *not* based on some experiment such as the atheists *are*

demanding, in which *only they* shall have a hand without ever telling us how it is to be designed definitively to reveal if present the *Spirit*, whose existence they deny! It is based on a *methodical analysis of the already existing hard facts of the entire universe*! No additional expensive “experiment”, as the “scientists” are *never at a loss to propose* in order to assure the *further convenient to them* expenditure of the funds of *others*, *is thus needed*! What we so far have lacked has *not* been some *crushing* experiment, but rather the *honest hard look on the data and the humility to confess what is plain before our eyes*! The law of gravitation, a *natural law of God*, *kills* careless people! This *is not* a “comfortable” world! It was *not* meant to be! So, the concomitants of the law *cannot* be *less shattering of all notions that are not built to withstand the fall*! A *totally other level of universal law is shown operative* in the world, *utterly beyond the ability of man to invent, but obviously not beyond his ability to discover once freed from not benign assumptions and theories*! God is *not* “mysterious”, as some “theologians” *inconsistently* state—only to increase the general confusion! He only has *higher, the very highest*, standards—and by them, *He stands in full view of all willing to see*! Nor are all His ways unknowable! Unless we stubbornly insist on “seeing” with our eyes of body and mind *shut firmly to all light*! If they were, *He would have lost* this “game” simply by designing it! To insist on such a line would do us no honor, and result in no benefit!

Do we believe in the *hard fact* of the physical world around us? Then we *must also recognize the harder yet fact of Law in it* that governs it! **And with it, its no less real and ineliminable Source!** Then, as the Law *remains* while its Source *cannot* be located in the physical universe that comprises *everything* material, we *must recognize it as a harder yet Logical Fact* that the Source is *immaterial*, no other than God, the *Pure Personal Logical Spirit*—the *totally other and hardest* category of Absolute Reality, that *cannot* be revealed by *any* physical experiment, but *only directly from same to same, from the Holy Spirit of God to the Spirit in us of us*, that so far *refuses* to contemplate the *Necessity of Unbroken Logicality at all levels*, that *alone* sustains us and the whole world around us in existence! It is *that* Logicality that allows the occasional killing under the law! *Obviously*, in order that we be shaken out of our complacency! In order that we *see* the Obvious *beyond* the “obvious”! In order that we *comprehend* that *not all* ends at death, but that *our Real Life begins with it*, having been given us from *Beyond*! To believe that the material rather than the *Logical* things are the hardest *is sheer folly*!

So does it in truth have to be: If we believe ourselves important, little gods by any measure, before we do and in order to do anything at all of real importance, *we must demonstrate not only the necessary logical faith both in ourselves and in the power of our reasoning; but also the bravery of holding fast upon the inevitability of its conclusions*, that even little gods of our own measure *cannot*

do without! If, instead, we believe ourselves unimportant, woe to us! According to our own evaluation of ourselves shall be given to us what we justly deserve!

To be justified, those who oppose these views *must* act! The traditional “theists”, to *show how* the God of Will and Passion, of *their* conception, is superior to *this* God, that is *also* of *Reason*! This they *cannot* do! Because, *not even God is complete without Reason*! The avowed atheists, looking for ways to eliminate God even from our thought, not just our vocabulary, to *show why* this entire reasoning is false! This they *cannot* do! Because, *the universal gravity has crushed them*! Which is why they do not show up to discuss the issues! *This is inexorable: Every man aspiring to be counted tall must make his clear statement standing!*

Unquestionably, this wide, *uncomfortable*, *beautiful* universe *would have been much happier not to include* this sorriest, most forlorn, self-made spectacle of the crushed whimperingly calling “fictitious” this Stone that crushed them and of people created to stand up but *lacking* the courage to straighten up their spines!

As *would have been* I too, if I hadn’t had to use such uncompromising, challenging language—not just for *their* presence in it, that I *had* known, but for their intellectual (let me in closing charitably call it) *timidity and resulting inconditeness*, that, in my own naïveté back in 1985, I had *not* imagined existent!

Forgive me for saying that I am curious to see the response, if any, of the theological and scientific experts on your staff! Before God-Logos, even by our silence we do speak volumes!

Sincere wishes,

71

Re: DR. HARPER'S REPLY

On September 19, 1998 and bypassing all the issues raised in my letter to him, Dr. Charles Harper was kind enough to respond on formal John Templeton Foundation letterhead as follows:

Dear Dr. Stavropoulos:

Thank you for your letter of July 29th. Please forgive the delay in reply. It is encouraging to know about your interest in Science and Religion and in the work of the Templeton Foundation. I have attached some materials which may be of interest to you. Please write to me again if you wish to be put on the Foundation's mailing list.

Sincerely yours

AUTHOR'S COMMENT: When one spends time and effort to compose a long letter he sends, not to mention the time and effort spent on *all the earlier work on which the arguments in his letter are based*, one naturally expects some serious comment on the thoughts he presents. As *decidedly none of the kind* was contained in Dr. Harper's reply, I painfully decided to save him the trouble of putting me on his mailing list and declined even responding, as I still judge that the *spiritual* needs of the world are altogether different from wasting trees to make paper for exchanging letters that produce no other effect than total waste.

**Re: PRESIDENTIAL INDISCRETIONS
AND THEIR CONSEQUENCES**

Rt. Hon. Mr. Henry Hyde, Chairman of the Judiciary Committee
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

December 28, 1998.

Dear Sir:

Living for a number of years overseas and watching the *sorrowful and intertwined* recent events at home and in the Middle East from my present vantage point, I have come to some thoughts that you may find of value:

(a) It is a hard fact that the *very special* relationship of the USA with the state of Israel since 1948 has cost us *enormously* in terms of relations with the other Middle Eastern states. As a result of that relationship, our international prestige is heavily damaged, since it is impossible to justify the double standard we apply, both in terms of funds spent in support of Israel rather than of needier states in the region, the goodwill and certainly the constant friendship of which we as a result have totally failed to secure, and in terms of loss of total benefit for the world, that would certainly have resulted had we so acted. It is particularly hard for those of us living abroad to defend our practices as a Nation in the eyes of ordinary people, given the *everywhere known fact of the much closer relationship of Citizens and State that we enjoy at home* than exists anywhere else in the world, as a result of which, our government's policies on foreign affairs reflect badly on ordinary American citizens living abroad that bear the brunt! Our government seems arrogantly to ignore, as others before, that America too will fail if she tries to rule the world by fear rather than *earned respect for her fairness!* You know all too well that just as *not all* so-called democracies are benign (even to themselves, let alone the whole world), so too *not all* so-called dictatorial regimes are ipso facto malign (when the peoples they *must* rule over are either too poor, ignorant or repressed to revolt, or don't have the *needed* well-developed sense of the rights and duties obligatory on ordinary people for the proper operation of democracy, and rather *support* their regimes anyhow, however odd that may seem to us! But while, for *that* reason, we *must* work out a modus vivendi even with unsavory regimes, *we must never cease*, being true to ourselves, to see to it that we *don't practice hubris either at home or abroad!*

That we truly are the best democracy in the world doesn't necessarily mean that all our ways both at home and abroad are ipso facto the best possible!

(b) If you carry out an unofficial, private, impromptu poll of US citizens of Jewish-origin serving in and around the highest echelons of our Government and the various channels of public affairs, you shall see at once that their numbers are *much too high* in relation to the census facts! *This is not fortuitous, but has been carefully engineered over the years, on purpose!* Nor, obviously, are such citizens better-trained in democracy than others! Then, you know that whereas for *all other* citizens of *later immigrant* ("ethnic") origin we use such terms as "Irish, or German, or Italian Americans", by which they also call themselves (but *not* in order thus to set themselves apart from all other Americans), for the citizens of Jewish origin we use almost exclusively the term "American Jews", and *only all too rarely and self-consciously* the term "Jewish Americans"! The reversal of adjectives and names *tallies exactly* with how the vast majority of the particular people concerned feel about *themselves* vis à vis the Country! This is *not* unique of the USA: In *every* country they live, *the Jews, by their own free admission, prefer to remain Jews rather than to develop a true sense of belonging*; and to use the advantages each system offers for *their own purposes rather than for the nations* to which they *seemingly* belong!

(c) The recent event of the Israeli Prime Minister *demanding* of *our* President that a notorious American Jew jailed for spying for Israel *be set free as yet another condition for the Israelis agreeing to honor their prior agreements and promises made* in order to achieve peace in troubled Palestine is significant! It brings to mind the Israeli Prime Minister at the time of the Gulf War *who demanded that the USA pay Israel some billions of dollars* in order that Israel *not take direct part on our side* in that war! *Every American must wonder* about the gall of *such supposedly "friendly"* foreign dignitaries making such naked extortionist demands! The latest one was *not* repudiated angrily on the spot by the President who moreover undertook to pay a *pointless* visit to Palestine for the sake of peace, but truly in support of Mr. Netaniahu and his party who *never* cared so much as hide his/their displeasure of the President's policies and glee over his problems! In so acting, was Mr. Netaniahu betting on the *enormously grown* power the American Jews wield over the *inner workings* of our Government, press and news networks? If so, what does *that* say of us, *thus duped and turned both as individuals and as an organized State into instruments of foreign interests, totally alien to American ideals?*

(d) Can there be any doubt that, were it not for the state of Israel, the USA *would have developed a far better and truly friendly* relationship especially with the Arab states (made of Moslem *and* Christian peoples), to the mutual benefit of us *and* them? Please believe me!: I am **not** calling for anything bizarre, just only for a *cooler, calmer, fairer, more even-handed re-examination of our poli-*

cies in that area, that, for our neglect of their total effects and for our trusting nature, affect even our own dignity and self-esteem as a fair nation! The Jews have other priorities, that are not the same as ours! Yet, we have let them use us! They and the Arabs hate each other ever since the first- and second-born of Abraham! Bending an ear solely to the Jews, we have not sought to ameliorate that immemorial Asiatic hatred! How do we justify to ourselves that we are entangled in it? The Jews want the Iraqis destroyed now for what they may do to them tomorrow! And they have turned us into their instrument of destruction! But what moral or reasonable law may punish before a potential criminal acts? Why, if that were permissible, even God ought to send us straight to hell, before even giving us a chance to live and sin! By listening to the Jews, we now have made the entire Middle Eastern problem still harder to solve!

(e) It seems to me to be the duty of *every citizen loving his country* that, to the best of his ability, he protect its public officials from corruption! In our case, most of all the President! Now, the *facts are* that a certain American Jew-ish young lady of *dubious* virtue started out from California to enter the White House *precisely in order to ensnare* the President! And given his proclivities, she succeeded! On her sperm-smearred dress, she got the “smoking-gun” equivalent that brought down the late President Nixon! She and her mother *certainly conspired to preserve that evidence*, that first of all *was the evidence of the young lady’s dubious virtue*! But what girl of *real* virtue and her mother would have kept such evidence? That those two would certainly speaks of *a/the higher* priority the two ladies attempted to serve! That they produced it when pressed certainly reveals their effort to cut *their* losses! *In starting out on their expedition and in preserving the evidence, did they act alone or on the express orders of others?* The special prosecutor offered them immunity. May that extend reasonably, legally even over the *potentially treasonous ensnarement* of the President? It does *not* appear that Mr. Starr covered *this* aspect of the affair in *any proper* sense! Given the most highly embarrassing nature of his committed indiscretion, solely on account of which the President found himself *forced to lie*, had that lie passed, is it or is it not a *fact* that our President *would have been held at the gun point of a most sinister blackmail* by those in the know? Surely you agree that *however unsavory*, even this aspect of the affair *must be investigated fully*! Our national security and general interests demand it! The few facts I here mentioned show the absolute need that the US Government *be freed* of the *not* benign Zionist embrace applied to it both at home and abroad! ***Sir, it seems unquestionable that there are people in this world, living amongst us, even in our home, who use us grossly for their interests and laugh at us for our credulity of thinking them benign!*** If we are ready to dismiss our President, we *must* also be ready to deal with them that *through him brought that disgrace on us all, and now try to keep him there in order that they further exploit to their*

further advantage his *greatly reduced* capacity to govern fairly, persuasively and effectively!

(f) As for the President, it is altogether amazing that by lying and insisting on lying further, he unwittingly worked himself into the *tight* corner of *obvious blackmail*! If there is more of this than has been made public or of some similar nature, it is clear that the evil, should he remain in place, *shall still be able to cause horrendous secret damage*! Quite clearly, *we cannot be assured* that by “censuring” him we shall have removed *all effects of treasonous possibilities*, the suspicion of which *he unwittingly permitted* to touch upon the Presidency! What he has done, as already discussed in public, thus *pales* in relation to his *failure* to realize the *highly dangerous aspect of the compromise he thus wrought on* the Presidency! *That is the true high crime, in this case literally (for the nature of the facts) bordering on, if not yet having crossed into, treason*, to which the Constitution refers, that certainly calls *at least* for the removal from office! *It is with extreme sadness that we cannot but conclude that our President has lost his own good witness! Only those having vast interests in the continuation of the effects of this sordid affair may cunningly continue to call for leniency!* The people support the President we are told. Would they still do so, were all this explained to them? That this entire matter *was with extreme prejudice instigated* by people calling themselves “US citizens” working for the Government *does not in the least lighten its severity!* The trial in the Senate *must educate* the Nation even on why especially the US President may never be too careful of *seeming* “friends”!

Sincerely,

Re: LETTER TO DR. GEORGE BISTIS

Professor George N. Bistis
64 Kline Boulevard
Berkeley Heights, NJ. 07922

January, 2, 1999.

(Excerpt)

On Greeks and Jews in the World

Dear George:

I want to thank you for your latest note ..., as well as for your previous one with which you sent me that article of the NY Times. It indeed caused me to fire off a letter to the director of the Templeton Foundation! As usual, it produced *no* response on the *substance*—just a query as to whether I wanted my name included in their mailing list! Later, and it has been almost three months since, I *handed* a somewhat enlarged version of that letter to an ex physicist/astronomer from the States now turned a monk (operating from a church here in Athens attached to an Athos Monastery) and “scientific advisor” to the Archbishop. There has been *absolutely no* response! The “Greek” [*and* other, alas!] potentates *never feel any moral obligation to respond*, however serious the matter! The more serious the matter, the better they hide!

So, what am I to say? That *irrationality* still rules the world? But you already know that! So, I will say only this!: That all nations and the world is still divided into two: Greeks and Jews! I. e., rationalists and *irrationalists*!

Contrary to established belief, even Einstein was an *irrationalist*! Just read his 1916 paper on general relativity! There, in his contorted fashion, he stated plainly that his purpose was *not* to produce as simple and logical a theory as possible, but such as the reader would feel it to be the most satisfying *psychologically*! The rest has been “scientific” history! As that other one has for two thousand years been “theological” history! Plato was the *last one* who did not hesitate to quarrel even with Homer (the Greek Moses) in order to save the Divine from the accretions upon It of man’s ignorance! Only last night a fool propounded from the idiot box that, “man does *not* become but is *born*”! Which truly says that *not he but God who made him is responsible for all his doings*! Now, tell me: Is this not the *most psychologically satisfying* description of human history?

The rationalist Greeks alone had a fully developed sense of hubris! The ever irrationalist Jews and their inheritors (be they even “Christian”) never had any such concept! The notion of “inherited” sin and sinfulness is a direct transfer to Adam (and through him to God, who so made all things, him and us) of our personal responsibility for our choosing (that inseparable part of our total spiritual Personal Freedom—a concept foreign to the Jews) to do evil! That the “Christian” Church chose to immortalize the Jewish hubris must not surprise! The first Christians were hardly at all converted Jews! Then, when the emphasis, as always, is on finding followers for ourselves, not true worshipers of God and doers of His will, we shall stop at nothing to make it easy for fools to follow us! Such true Greek elements as exist in Christianity were both late in appearing and badly compromised by the already long acclimatization to pure Jewish thinking! If God is presented (as He has not been) as demanding by Right of Justice only the very best of our total selves (a pure Greek concept!), how many do you think would be willing to show up in the churches? The “argument” has always been that we shall “educate” them to do God’s will in the churches, after we bring them there! So, we have opened the churches to all comers! The most successful “theologians” have been those who fill the churches (and collection trays) the most! What do you think: that such people shall ever stop, and think that by this process we corrupt the churches, and produce no Theology but only heresy and blasphemy? If there is so little Reason in “Christianity”, it is solely due to that the first “Christians” were not Greeks but Jews, people with no sense of, and absolutely no training in, Reason! Little or nothing has changed since! The world has arrived in its present state not only by degrees but also because the Jews, not the Greeks triumphed, even as “Christians”! So, how do you put even some sense of Reason into them? What “Reason” you may find in their sayings (yes, they have the temerity to write it as Reason and Logos!) is there only in support of their irrationality!

I shall state it plainly once again: We can only begin by recognizing that there is us and the world around us! Do we believe in ourselves? Rationally, or irrationally? By that measure of belief do we decide all issues! If we believe in ourselves irrationally, there is no point in ever writing a single word down! It shall, because it then can, carry no meaning whatsoever! But if we believe in ourselves rationally, we must believe that what exists out there around us is not due to some peculiar, mysterious, uncertain, sinister, dark forces that inherently affect even us (our subconscious, conscious, psychological, intellectual, spiritual, total self) but is totally free of such forces because it exists rationally! [Otherwise, we only subjugate our rationality, our only light (that is, what little then remains of it!) to the forces of darkness and make a terrible mess of things!: Patches at best of little if any light and mostly of thick darkness; usually, a very dark gray cold fog beclouding the mind, freezing the soul, numbing with terror

the “spirit of (*hu*)man” [as in Latin the emphasis is on the *humus*!] and making *wildly wailing irrational women of us all! Not a Greek spectacle! A Jewish one! Freud be the witness!* But then, the *career astrologers*, “*astronomers*” and “*scientists*” *also* be the witnesses! Don’t the latter believe in the existence out there of a *mysterious* force *opposing* gravity and *producing* the expansion of the universe? Don’t they *refuse* to acknowledge the *rational* operation of the *infinite* initial velocity of expansion *compatible* with gravity under constant *G* and *M*?] But the world exists rationally either because it contains *Reason* as an *inseparable* part of itself, or because *It* was *given* to it (as *It* could *best* be given to it, being what it is) from the *outside*!: There is *no third* option! If the former, the Laws controlling the world and making it rational (*not* the so-called “laws” of professors!) *must have a scientifically discoverable origin within the world!* And the world *must have a scientifically discoverable mechanism for their transmission and for the control of all operations subject to them!* If such are not found, *we must question our entire supposed scientificity!* The thing we *cannot* do is to blame the world for playing “tricks” on us! A rational world plays *no* tricks! *All* we find suspect in our scientificity *we must cast out!* If we *still find no* worldly origin of Laws and *no* worldly mechanism of transmission and control, *we then are rationally left with only the latter option!*: That the Laws then have an *otherworldly* origin and means of application!: As with our laws, so too with the Laws: They *don’t* exist in the vacuum, but are devised in a *Rational Mind!* They *don’t* apply mysteriously but by the *Will of It!* A visitor to our world would see *only* buildings and traffic, *no* mechanism for our social operations! These we control *solely by our physically invisible yet acting will!* As our mind and will suffice here, so the Mind and Will suffice there! *This, no other, must* be our *only rational* conclusion! That has *not* been reached by philosophers, or “scientists”, or “theologians”! Because *they lack the required rational faith in themselves!* *The mature faith in God belongs only to the rationalists!* To the irrationalists, as they fully deserve it, belongs *only the mess of things!* No matter how little we like it, the *naked hard fact* of the Laws remains: If we jump off a high cliff, we *shall* get killed! The Law of gravity *holds and is no figment, no matter* what Einstein said! Getting killed is *no figment!* Einstein & Co. have *not* produced a frame of reference in which the death due to the *supposed fictitious* force of gravity *continues to appear* as life! Beginning from *our rational faith in ourselves*, we find the world around us *rational!* *And rational Law in it that governs it!* That *as such* has grave consequences!: It demands the *Rational Mind and Will* of God, that leave *absolutely nothing* indeterminate, *no matter* what *Godless Jewish “science”* says! The *rational Law leaves nothing in the dark and lights the true Beginning of things:* For without the Logos of God, there would be *no* rational world, and *no* rational us! *Even if we then existed at all, we would be unable to test our rationality, by which alone we learn!* But to

get to all this, you *must* be guided by the *Rational Greek Light that alone admits of no Asiatic darkness, as it alone takes directly after the Rational Mind/Light of God!* On which subject, the Greeks of all nations need make absolutely no apology, and only pity such as Hawking & Co. spent in contortions, seeking to evade the Beginning of things!

So, *by our choice of rational or irrational nationality shall we all be made known!* The rest, far from being the Shakespearean “silence”, *must* be left to the *Just Judgment of Reason!*

Have a happy New Year! May it be the *last* of the Dark Ages! Let me know of your health and plans!

Yours,

PS. If the world *were* Greek rather than Jewish, do you think Bill would have been bewitched by Monica, in *that latest Jewish conspiracy against the world*, the head of which the Zionists *studiously sought to compromise and now seek to obtain “leniency” for, in order that they yet better serve their purposes?* *Only for the mucus in our eyes* do we still refuse to see how the Jews lead the world, and have entangled even America in their *Asiatic* hatred of their neighbor, *whom they demand destroyed before he has any chance to commit any sin against them!* All in all, a *very becoming* attitude for the “pious” yet *irrational* “People of God”, that *alone* think the world revolving around Zion, or Rome, or Constantinople, or Washington, rather than *solely around its rational center*, that’s no other than Reason Himself!

I do very much hope you shall find my sarcasm expressed, as *is, not* in malice but *only in the full measure of the facts before us*, that permit *no* optimism—unless we change course ἐπὶ τὸ ἀληθῶς ἑλληνικώτερον! As we go, only *fools* may feel optimistic! Just *why and how* am I, *if* I am, wrong? *If* I am wrong, charity demands that *I* have the mucus of *my* eyes removed! So, it is *not* charity, but the *never sleeping hatred of Reason* that compels the silence of them all!

Re: LETTER TO MR. ST. ZOULAS

Κύριον Στάμον Ζούλαν, Δ/ντήν
Ἐφημερίδα ΚΑΘΗΜΕΡΙΝΗΝ
Σωκράτους 57, Ἀθήνας, 10431

26 Ἀπριλίου 1999.

Ἀγαπητὲ Κύριε Ζούλα:

Πρὸ τοῦ Πάσχα αἰτήσαντός μου ἰδεῖν ὑμᾶς προσωπικῶς, ἡ γραμματεὺς ὑμῶν ἡρνήθη παρασχεῖν μοι ὡς καὶ ἐλάχιστον τμῆμα τοῦ πολυτίμου ὑμῶν χρόνου, δηλώσασα ὅτι ἔὰν ἔχω τι λέγειν ὑμῖν, κάλλιον ἔστι γράψαι ὑμῖν! Ἀλλαχόθεν καταγιγνώσκων τὴν πικροτάτην ἀπώλειαν χρόνου ἀναλωθέντος εἰς παραγωγὴν κειμένων δυσaráεστων τοῖς αὐτῶν ἀποδέκταις, ἐν ἀρχῇ ἀπεφάσισ' ἀντιπαρελθεῖν ὁ καθορῶ ἐμοῦ χρέος, ἐλπίζων σύναμ' ἐπὶ τῇ ταχείᾳ τοῦ πρὸ ἡμῶν πάντων μεγάλου προβλήματος ἄρσει! Πρὸ τινων ἡμερῶν ὅμως, ὡς μὲν αὕτη βραδύνει, ἡ δὲ περὶ αὐτὸ πολιτεία ἡμῶν αὐθις συλληφθέντων πνευματικῶς ἀπαρασκευάστων *μεγάλως* ἡμᾶς ζημιοί, ἡ δ' ὡς ἄνω ἀπόφασις *πιθανῶς ὑμᾶς ἀδικεῖ ὅπερ οὐδόλως ἐπιθυμῶ*, διὰ τοῦτ' ἀπεφάσισ' αὐθις χρόνον πολυτίμον δαπανῆσαι, νῦν ἐπὶ τῷ γράφειν ὑμῖν! Πλὴν ὡς οὐ μόνον τὰ γραπτὰ μένει *ἀλλὰ καὶ δεσμεῖ γράφοντά τε καὶ ἀναγνώστην, ἀναποφεύκτως* ἄρ' ἀπομένει ἰδεῖν τί νῦν *ὑμεῖς* πράξετε περὶ τὰ ὑπὸ τίτλον "Τῆς Ἱστορίας πνευματικῶς ὁρωμένης" συνημμένως τῇ παρούσῃ δεικνύμενα!

Βεβαίως δικαιούσθε ἀνάξια κρίνειν αὐτά! Κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἴδιον μέτρον ἕκαστος ἡμῶν κρίνει! Πλὴν, διότι βαρύτερός ἐστιν ὁ δημόσιος λόγος, ἐγὼ μὲν συνέχομαι φόβῳ τὰ συνημμένα ὑμῖν ὑποβάλλων πρὸς δημοσίευσιν (διότι ἄλλως ἀπολεσθήσεται ἡ πολλή μου περὶ ταῦτα προσπάθεια εἰ ὑμᾶς μόνον σχίσεται ἀποδέκτην), ὑμᾶς δὲ χρὴ ἀναλογισθῆναι μὴ *ἀναποφεύκτως* ἐφθάσαμεν ᾧδε, τοιούτου ὡς καθ' ἡμέραν ὁρᾶται ὄντος τοῦ ποιοῦ τῶν παντοειδῶν δημοσιευμάτων δι' ὧν ὁ λαὸς *δημαγωγικῶς κατὰ συνείσθημα* ὁδηγεῖται πρὸς ὄλεθρον, δι' ὃ ἀναμφιβόλως καὶ οἱ τὰ κείμενα ἐπιλέγοντες ὡσαύτως βαρυτάτην ἔχουσι τὴν εὐθύνην!

Ἐὰν μακρὸν λίαν τὸ κείμενον κρίνητε, παρακαλῶ ὅπως σὺν αὐτῷ κρίνητε καὶ τὸ πῶς καὶ πρὸς τί καταδαπανᾶται ὁ χώρος!

Ἐὰν ἐπιλέξητε δημοσιεῦσαι τὰ συνημμένα, παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς ὅπως δημοσιεύσητε ταῦτα κατὰ Κυριακὴν διὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἀναγνωστῶν, προβῆτε δ' εἰς *φωτογραφικὴν ἀποτύπωσιν*, ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς τὸν χρόνον καὶ κόπον οἰκονομήσητε, καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα μὴ κακοποιηθῇ! Διότι τὰ γραπτὰ μένει καὶ τὰ συνημμένως ἐξεταζόμενα διαθέει τὴν Ἱστορίαν, ἄρ' εἰς γλῶσσαν ἀνάλογον

χρή με διαπραγματευθῆναι αὐτά! Οὐδεμίαν οὖν περὶ τῆς γλώσσης ἥς χρώ-
μαι χρή με ποιῆσαι ἀπολογίαν! Ἕτεροι ὄψονται, οἱ τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον ἀπαί-
δευτον καὶ περὶ τὴν γλῶσσαν τῶν προγόνων τηρήσαντες καὶ τηροῦντες, ἀπ’
εὐτελείας εἰς χεῖρον· εὐτέλειαν καθ’ ἡμέραν ὀδηγοῦντες αὐτόν, μᾶλλον ἢ
ἐπὶ τᾶριστον τέλος!

Τὰς στήλας ἐποίησα εἰς εὖρος πενταστήλου. Ὁ τύπος τῶν γραμμάτων
[τάποσταλέντος κειμένου] ἐστὶ SymbolGreek καὶ Palatino, Size 10, τῆς
Linguist’s Software, Inc., for the Macintosh American keyboard. Ἐὰν
ἐπιθυμῆτε ἄλλο τι μέγεθος κἀγὼ δύνωμ’ ἄλλως πως βοηθῆσαι, παρακαλῶ μὴ
διστάσῃτε!

Μετὰ πάσης τιμῆς,

Re: ΤΗΣ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑΣ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΩΣ ΟΡΩΜΕΝΗΣ

(Ὑπεβλήθη συνημμένως τῇ προηγουμένῃ)

Τοῦτο πρῶτον διερωτᾶται: Αὐθις τῶν νεφῶν ἐνσχυψάντων ἀντιλαμβανόμεθα τί ποιούμεν, ἢ διατί καὶ πῶς ποιούμεν ὅ,τι ποιούμεν ὡς συγκεκριτημένος λαὸς οἱ νῦν τοῦ Ἑλλήνων ὀνόματος χρώμενοι; Ἀντιλαμβανόμεθ' ὅτι μόνον διὰ τοῦ Λογικοῦ Νοῦ ἀντιλαμβανόμεθ' ὅσα μόνα παράγομεν καλῶς διειργασμένα νοήματα; Ὅτι διὰ μόνων αἰσθήσεων καὶ συναισθήσεων μόνον αἰσθανόμεθα καὶ συναισθανόμεθα παράγοντες μόν' ἀκατέργαστ' αἰσθήματα καὶ συναισθήματα; Ὅτι καὶ τὸ τίνας εἶναι ἡμᾶς κατὰ μόνον τὸν Λόγον δεῖται κατανοεῖσθαι, οὐχὶ κατ' αἴσθημα ἢ συναίσθημα;

Ἀντιλαμβανόμεθ' ὅτι προσπαθοῦντες ἀπερισκέπτως ἀκολουθεῖν τὴν διττὴν ἑλληνικὴν καὶ "ὀρθόδοξον χριστιανικὴν" ἡμετέραν "παράδοσιν", ἣν ἀκρίτως θεωροῦμεν καλῶς ὑφ' ἡμῶν ὑπηρετουμένην, ἀπλῶς νῦν ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις παραφρονούμεν δεινῶς; Ὅτι ἀπερισκέπτως ἀλλὰ σκοπίμως ἐγκαταλείποντες τὴν καιριωτάτην σοφιστείας καὶ φιλοσοφίας διάκρισιν αὐτοπαρεδόθημεν χερσὶν ὅλως ἀκαταλλήλων χειραγωγῶν αἰσχυρά, κενά, παράλογα, φλύαρα διατεινομένων; Ὁρθῶς φιλοσοφούντες οἱ Ἕλληνες οἱ ἀρχαῖοι τὸν Λόγον μόνον ἔθηκαν ὑπὲρ πάντα, δικαιοτάτα Λόγον αὐτὸν τὸν Θεὸν ὀνομάσαντες! Τὰς ἀλόγους σοφιστῶν ὅμως ἡμεῖς ἤδη ἀπὸ δισχιλιετίας ἀκολουθοῦντες διδασκαλίας παραδιδόμεθ' ἀσμένως οὐχὶ μόνον λόγοις δημαγωγῶν Λόγου κεινοῖς, σοφὰ δοκοῦντες ἃ ὅλως ἄσοφα λέγουσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ βλασφημοῖς κεινολογίαις ἀνατολῆς ἕως τοῦ νῦν ἀπαιδεύτου περὶ τὸν Λόγον διαμεινιάσης, διαχωρισάσαις ἀπὸ τοῦ Λόγου ὡς καὶ τὸν Θεόν, ἃς προσδεχόμεθ' ἀκατανοήτως ὡς ὑψίστην, δῆθεν Ὁρθόδοξον, Θεολογίαν! Πῶς δύναται κεινὴ Λόγου "Θεολογία" ὑπάρξει οἱ χρώμενοι λόγων ὅλως ἀγνώστου νοήματος ἔτι παρ' ἡμῖν αὐταποκαλούμενοι πλὴν ἀσυγγνώστως παραλογιζόμενοι καὶ τοὺς ἀφελεῖς ἐξ ἡμῶν καταδημαγωγοῦντες ἐπὶ ταπεινοῖς (ἵνα δι' αὐτῆς αὐτοὶ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς προσκολλῶνται ἵνα κείνους διὰ τοῦ πρὸ τοῦ "ἀκαταλήπτου" φόβου τυφλοὶ παραλόγως ἀκολουθῶσιν) ἡμέτεροι "Θεολόγοι", περὶ ὅλως ἄλλα τυρβάζοντες, οὐχὶ δὲ περὶ μόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ τε καὶ Λόγου, οὐδέποτε ἔξήγησαν, πείθοντες τοὺς βαρὺν περιεχόμενον ἐχούσας τὰς λέξεις σεβομένους!

Διὰ τοῦτο ἀφ' ἡμῶν διαφεύγει ὅτι οὐκ ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος δοκῶν ἀνορθόδοξα τὰ παρ' αὐτοῦ πιστευόμενα! Ποία οὖν ἄρα ἡ ἀξία τοῦ λόγου ἡμῶν μόνων ὅτι "ἡμεῖς" ἐσμέν μόνοι "Ὁρθόδοξοι"; Ἡτλημένως ἀπὸ τοῦ Λόγου διαχωρίσαντες ἑαυτοὺς ἀπαιτοῦμεν παρ' ἄλλων ἀποδέχεσθ' ἀναντιρρήτως τοὺς ἡμετέρους ἀλόγους ἰσχυρισμοὺς ὡς μόνους Λόγου μεστούς! Ἀλλὰ πῶς πέραν τᾶκρου τῆς ρίνος ἡμῶν, πάντως δὲ πέραν τῶν ὀρίων τοῦ βαλκα-

νικου χωρίου ἡμῶν, ὀλοσχερῶς ἀρνούμενοι βλέπειν δοκοῦμεν ἑαυτοὺς Ὀρθοδόξους; Ἐὰν κεχώρισται ἡ Ὀρθοδοξία ἀπὸ τῆς Λογικῆς ἀνάγκης ἓνα, εἰναῖον, ὑπὸ Λογικοὺς νόμους κείμενον θεωρεῖν πάντα τὸν κόσμον, Λογικῶς καθολικῶς κατασκευασθέντα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ; Ἡ μήπως "ὀρθοδόξως" ἀρνούμεθα ταῦτα ἐμμένοντες ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀλόγοις "πατρίαις" ἡμῶν παραδόσει ταῖς ἀρνούμεναις τὴν κόσμου μελέτην; Ἐὰν κεχώρισται ἡ Ὀρθοδοξία ἀπὸ τῆς συνεχοῦς ἀναζητήσεως τῆς Ἀληθείας, χαλεπῶς ἀποκαλυπτομένης μόνοις τοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ ταπεινῶς καὶ εἰλικρινῶς ἀναζητεῖν αὐτὴν μηδέποτε παύουσι; Πῶς οὖν ἀπὸ μακροῦ ἤδη παύσαντες διώκειν Ἀλήθειαν καὶ διελέγχειν πάντα τὰ πρὸ ἡμῶν Ὀρθόδοξοι ἔτι ἐσμέν;

Κατ' ἀρχάς, ἔστιν ἄρα, ὅπερ οὐκ ἔστιν, Ὀρθόδοξον πᾶν τὸ παρ' ἐμοῦ δοκούμενον ὡς ὀρθὸν καὶ οὐκ ὀρθὸν ἦ, τουτέστι πᾶσά μου δοξασία διὰ μόνον τὸ εἶναι ταύτην ἐμὴν, ἢ μόνον τὸ οὐσίᾳ οὐ τύποις ὀρθῶς δοξαζόμενον διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸ σὺν Θεῷ ἐμπραγμάτως ὀρθὸν καὶ αὐτῷ ἀπαρέσκωμαι; Πῶς οὐ τὸ δεύτερον μόνον; Πῶς οὖν ἀφ' ἡμῶν διαφεύγει ὅτι δι' αὐτὸ τὸ ἐμπράγματον, κατὰ Λόγον, ἀδιαχωρίστως μία ἐστὶν ἡ τε Ὀρθοδοξία καὶ Ὀρθοπραγία ὡς χῶτι ἀπὸ μόνης ἱκανῶς τῆς δευτέρας, ἀσφαλῶς κάλανθάστωσιν ἡ πρώτη τεκμαίρεται; Ἀλλὰ δύναται λέγειν τις ἀληθῶς, ἀχλευάστως, ὅτι ὀρθοπραγοῦμεν ἡμεῖς ὡς λαός; Ἐὰν οὕτε ὀρθοδοξοῦμεν!

Πῶς ἂν ἔστιν, ὅπερ οὐκ ἔστιν, Ὀρθόδοξον τάνεξετάστως πάντων τῶν προηγουμένων καὶ συναφῶν ἄρχεσθαι συλλογίζεσθ' ἀπὸ τινος αὐθαίρετου σημείου, ὡς ἀνορθοπραγοῦντες ποιοῦμεν, τυφλῶς ἀπὸ πάθους εἰς πάθος ἀγόμενοι, οὐδέποτ' ἀπὸ Λόγου εἰς ἔτι πληρέστερον Λόγον φερόμενοι; Αὐθις τῶν τε νεφῶν ἐνσκιφάντων κάνετοίμων ἡμῶν κατὰ πατρώαν, ἀρνούμενην Λογικῶς ἐτοιμάσαι τὸ μέλλον παράδοσιν εὐρεθέντων, πόθεν οὖν νῦν Ὀρθοδόξως δεῖ ἡμᾶς ἄρξεσθ' ἐξετάζειν τὴν ἐθνικὴν πορείαν ἡμῶν ἀγαγοῦσαν ἡμᾶς ὧδε παραπαίοντας ἐνώπιον τοῦ ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις ἀγνώστου ἡμῖν παρελθόντος ἡμῶν καὶ τρέμοντας πρὸ τοῦ σκοτεινοῦ ἡμῖν ἡμῶν μέλλοντος ὅπερ αἰεὶ ἄσοφοι οὐχ ἐτοιμάζομεν νήφοντες ἀλλὰ προσδοκῶμεν παθητικῶς, διαπληκτιζόμενοι κυνῶν χεῖρῳ βλακωδῶς συνεχῶς, διονυσιαζόμενοι ἀφρόντιδες ἀνατολικῶς δι' ἡμέρας τε καὶ νυκτός; Πῶς οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ σημείου ἐν ᾧ ἀπὸ τοῦ Λόγου ἐχωρίσθημεν ὡς λαός; Ἐν ᾧ διέφυγεν ἀφ' ἡμῶν ὅτι ὑποσκάπτομεν αὐτὴν τὴν ἡμετέραν ὑπαρξιν ὡς λαοῦ διαμένοντες πεισματικῶς διηρημένοι διὰ μικρότητα προσωπικῶν καὶ τοπικῶν συμφερόντων, διὰ στενότητα ψυχῆς, δι' ἀδράνειαν πνεύματος διαμένοντες ἐπ' αἰῶνας μακροῦς ἀκαλλιεργήτου περὶ τὰ σπουδαῖα; Διὰ μικρότητα οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ὑπὸ τὸν Περικλῆν ἤρξαντο τοὺς λοιποὺς Ἕλληνας ἀδικοῦντες! Διὰ μικρότητα οἱ Ἕλληνες ὑπὸ τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον ἐξεστράτευσαν κατὰ τῶν Περσῶν! Βαρβάρως οἱ Πέρσαι κατὰ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐπῆλθον; Πῶς οὐχ ὁμοίως οἱ Ἕλληνες αὐτοῖς ἀνταπέδωκαν; Ἀλλὰ τόλμησον εἰπεῖν τοῦτο τοῖς "πατριώταις"! Διὰ μικρότητα οἱ Βυζαντινοὶ παραλαβόντες ἀκόπως τὴν αὐτοκρατορίαν Ῥωμαίων ἐξεμῆδένισαν τὴν Ῥώμην αὐτῆς, σβέσαντες τὰρχαῖον πολιτισμοῦ φῶς, εἰσαγαγόντες τὸν κόσμον εἰς τὸ μεσαιωνικὸν ἀπ' ἀνατολῆς σκότος, καλλιεργήσαντες-κακουργήσαντες τὰσιατικὸν κατὰ τοῦ ἐλληνικοῦ πολιτισμοῦ θρησκευτικὸν μῖσος, ἐπιβαλόντες οὐκ ἄνευ διωγμῶν τῶν ἐλλόγων ἐπὶ γῆς θεί-

ων πλασμάτων τὴν *ἄνευ Λόγου* ὁμοδοξίαν διὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν *δῆθεν* "Ὁρθοδοξίαν" τῆς *αὐτῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦς* "ἐκκλησίας" (ἀναγορευθείσης εἰς τὴν *μόνην* ἐπὶ γῆς *δῆθεν* "κατὰ θεῖαν ἐπιταγὴν δεδικαιωμένην" ὀντότητα "δικαιωματικῶς", *ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, κατέχουσιν *ἅπασαν* τὴν πνευματικὴν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ προτεραιότητα τοῦ μὲν κράτους ἀφ' ἐνὸς *ὀριακῶς* "κατ' ἀνοχήν καὶ θεῖαν οἰκονομίαν" ὁμολογουμένου ὡς "ἀναγκαίου κακοῦ" πρὸς *ἐλεγχον* τοῦ "κατὰ μέγα θεῖον μυστήριον" ἐνυπάρχοντος ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ γενικωτέρου κακοῦ, καὶ *παροχὴν* τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ κρατικῆς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ προστασίας, *ἀεὶ ἀναμενομένης*, ἵν' ἀφ' οὗ αὕτη ἐλευθερουμένη χωρὴ πρὸς τὴν εἰρηνικὴν ἐπιδίωξιν τῶν *κατ' αὐτὴν* πνευματικῶν ἀγαθῶν, ὧν φεῦ ἕνεκ' αὕτη τελικῶς περιήχθη, *μέχρι καὶ τῆσδε ἡμέρας*, εἰς τὴν παροχὴν εὐλογίας *πᾶσι* τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ κράτους τεκταινομένοις, οὗ αὐτὴν προστατεύοντος "ἀναγκαίου κακοῦ" ἐν ἀρχῇ δηλωθέντος *μέρος ἐκὸν τὸ ὅλον* "δικαιολογοῦν" αὕτη οὕτω κατέστη, τοῦ δ' ἀνθρώπου ἀφ' ἐτέρου οὕτως ὑποβιβασθέντος εἰς *μέλος αὐτῆς*, *σκεῦος αὐτοῦ*, καὶ *ὄργανον ἄβουλον ἀμφοτέρων*, *μικρὰν ἕως οὐδεμίαν ἔχον ἰδίαν ἀξίαν* ἐν ᾧ μεσαιωνικῶ πλην ἔτι διαιωνιζομένῳ *δῆθεν* θεολογικῷ *casuistic* κατασκευάσματι συνεῖλον τὰ *θεῖα ἀπολωλότα* δι' ὧν *ἐκάστος* τὴν σωτηρίαν ἐλήλυθεν ὁ Χριστὸς εἰς *ὑπὲρ αὐτὰ* σύνολον περὶ ὃ μόνον *δῆθεν* *πᾶσα ἡ Χριστοῦ φροντίς* ἐστίν, οὗ ἕνεκεν *ἕως τῆσδ' ἡμέρας* *λυσσωδῶς τίθενται κατὰ πάσης ἰδέας* τῷ ἀτόμῳ-ἀνθρώπῳ-προσώπῳ διδούσης τὸ κύριον μέλημα, καθιστάσης τὸν *ἐκαστον ἄνθρωπον* κύριον κατὰ πάντα καὶ διὰ πάντα ἐν τούτῳ τῷ κόσμῳ *ὑπεύθυνον*, οὐ μόνον κατὰ τὰρχαῖον ἑλληνικὸν πρότυπον ἀλλὰ καὶ κατ' αὐτὴν τὴν ἰδέαν τῆς Κρίσεως καθ' ἣν ὁ *ἐκαστος ἄνθρωπος*, οὐχ ἡ "ἐκκλησία", ἀπολογηθήσεται περὶ πεπραγμένων, ὃν ἀλόγως *αὐτοὶ τε καὶ πάντες οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς* ἔτι θέλουσι καὶ *αὐτῶν* ὅλως ἄβουλον, ὑπὸ φόβου μεγάλου διακατεχόμενον, οὐδὲν τούτων κατανοοῦντα, μεσαιωνικὸν ὑπήκοον δοῦλον καὶ μόνον ἀπολογούμενον τῷ Θεῷ), *ἀπαγορεύσαντες* τὴν *ἱερὰν* ἐλευθερίαν τῆς κατὰ *Λόγον* γνώμης καὶ πίστεως καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ τὰ *εὐγενικὰ* *πρόσω* ὠθοῦσαν τὸν ἄνθρωπον παραγωγὴν ἐπιστήμης καὶ γνώσεως! Τολμήσωμεν ἐπὶ τέλους συγκρίναι τὴν παραγωγὴν πολιτισμοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως Ῥώμης ἕως κτίσεως Κ/πόλεως κάπο κτίσεως ἕως πτώσεως τῆς δευτέρας, τουτέστι κατὰ διαστήματα χρόνου ὡς ἀκριβῶς ἴσα! *Τίς* εἰ μὴ ὁ *ἔχων τὸ φῶς* ἄρ' εὐθύνεται διὰ τὴν σβέσιν αὐτοῦ; *Τίς* εἰ μὴ *μόνος ὁ ἄσπεμνος* (διὰ τὴν παρ' αὐτοῦ μόνον νομιζομένην ἀνωτέραν ἰδίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ "πίστιν") *ἔκτοτε διαρκῆς ἀναιδὴς βυζαντινὸς ὑπερόπτης*, εἰ μὴ *μόνος ὁ λέγων* ὅτι κατέχει τὴν *πᾶσαν Ἀλήθειαν ἀλλὰ οὐ δι'* αὐτὴν συνεχόμενος φόβῳ μεγάλῳ ὅτι *ἔνεστιν ἐς ἀναλήθειαν τοὺς ἥσσονας παρασύρει* ἐπιβαλλόμενος αὐτοῖς διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου ἰσχυρισμοῦ περὶ Ἀληθείας *παραμενούσης* *πᾶσιν ἡμῖν ἐπὶ μέρους* μόνον γνωστῆς, εἰ μὴ *μόνος ὁ καλλίονα δοκῶν ἑαυτόν ἀλλ'* οὐκ *ἀναλαμβάνων* τὸ μάλα *μείζον* καλλίονος χρέος *ἀρραγῇ διαφυλάξαι τὴν μίαν* Ἐκκλησίαν Χριστοῦ ἄρα *κυρίως* εὐθύνεται διὰ τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ ἐπελθὸν σχίσμα καὶ *πάντα τὰ κεῖνο ἀκολουθήσαντα*; Ἀλλὰ τόλμησον εἰπεῖν πάντα ταῦτα τοῖς "Ὁρθόδοξοις"!

Ὑπὸ σοφιστῶν καὶ δημαγωγῶν παρωθούμενοι θεωροῦμεν ἐθνικὸν κλέος καὶ τὴν *τοιαύτην* ἐπ' ἄλλων ἡμετέραν ἐπιβολὴν [ἀμάρτημα πρὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ

ὅμως μέγα τὴν ἐφ' ἡμῶν ἄλλων] καὶ τὴν τοιαύτην μεσαιωνικὴν ἡμῶν πολι-
τείαν [δι' ἧς *δικαίως* καὶ ἐδουλώθημεν, *παραφρονήσαντες* προτιμήσαντες
ἀποδέξασθ' ἀλλόθρησκον βάρβαρον ὡς ἀπόλυτον κύριον, προσφιλέστερον
ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν δουλικὴν πρὸ ἀρχόντων βυζαντινὴν ἡμετέραν "παράδοσιν",
μᾶλλον ἢ *σωφρονούντες* ἐγκαίρως συνδιαλλάξασθαι μετ' ἁλλοδόξων ἀδελφῶν
(διὰ τὴν κοινὴν ἐπὶ Χριστῷ πίστιν), μεθ' ὧν ἔτι ἀντιδικοῦμεν διὰ μόνον τὸ
θρησκευτικὸν μῖσος, *τεχνηέντως* ἐπιβληθὲν μὲν ἡμῖν πᾶσι δῆθεν διὰ τὸ
δόγμα, ἀληθῶς ὅμως δὲ διὰ τὸ τίνα, τοῦτον ἢ κείνους δεῖ ὡς δούλους ἡμᾶς
δέχεσθ' ἀπόλυτον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς δῆθεν "πνευματικὸν" ἄρχοντα! Οὐκ ἀκριβῶς
ταῦτα ὑπονοεῖ σοφιστικῶς-δημοκοπικῶς "*ἐμπνέων*" καὶ ὁ παρὼν τῆς ἑλλα-
δικῆς [οὐ τῆς ἐν Ἑλλάδι οὐσῆς Χριστοῦ] ἐκκλησίας ἀρχιεπίσκοπος; Τί ἐ-
στιν ὅμως μείζον τε ἀπιδιωκτέον; Τὸ δι' ὅπλων ἐπιβάλλεσθ' ἐπ' ἁλλοτρίων,
ἐν ᾧ καταδαπανᾶται ἢ τοῦ ἔθνους ἀλκή, ἢ πολὺ μᾶλλον τὸ προάγειν αὐτὸν
τὸν πολιτισμὸν ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς μείζονα δόξαν, ἐν ᾧ μόνῳ ὑπάρχει πάντα τὰ
τιμῶντα τοὺς τε ἄνθρωπον καὶ Θεόν, ἐν ᾧ μόνῳ οἱ τε ἄνθρωπος καὶ Θεὸς
χαίρουσι *συνεργάζεσθαι*, ἐν ᾧ μόνῳ ὁ ἄνθρωπος σκοπὸν ζωῆς κτῶμενος με-
τὰ χαρᾶς καὶ βεβαιότητος *δικαίως* ἐπὶ τὸ μέλλον προσβλέπει; Ἄρα διὰ πο-
λέμους ὁ Θεὸς παρήγαγεν ἡμᾶς εἰς τὸ εἶναι, ἢ μᾶλλον διὰ τὸ ἐπὶ ταύτης
τῆς γῆς ὑφ' ἡμῶν κοπιωδῶς τρεπομένης εἰς παράδεισον χοῖκὸν ἐτοιμάσαι
ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς διὰ τὸν ἄλλον Παράδεισον, οὐ οὕτω μόνον καταστηθισόμεθα
πολῖτ' ἐπάξιοι; Πῶς οὐχ οὕτω σκεπτόμεθα, ὀρθοδόξως δοκοῦντες ἡμᾶς αὐ-
τοὺς λατρεύοντας τὸν Θεόν, οὗ τὴν φοβερὰν κρίσιν *βυζαντινῶς* ἐδιδάχθη-
μεν τρέμειν διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν, ἀκατανοήτους ἡμῖν ἐν τῷ πλήρει
ἀριθμῷ καὶ μεγέθει αὐτῶν, οὐκ ἐξαγοραζόμενας διὰ "θρησκευτικῶν" ἔργων
ἀενάως τηρούντων ἡμᾶς πρὸ αὐτῶν, διὰ τῆς ἐφ' ὧν *συνεχοῦς ἐγωιστικῆς*
προσηλώσεως ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν μόνον ἕκαστος στρέφει πᾶσαν τὴν προσοχὴν ἀρ-
νούμενος παραδίδοσθαι τῇ Θεῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ πρὸς ἄσκηνα Λογικὰ ἔργα πολι-
τισμοῦ, οὐ στείρας "θρησκευτικότητος", ὠθούσῃ τὸν ἔνθεον ἄνθρωπον; Οὐ-
τε οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ὑπὸ τὸν Περικλῆν, οὐτε οἱ Ἕλληνες ὑπὸ τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον,
οὐτε οἱ βυζαντινοὶ ὑπὸ τοὺς ἱερεῖς αὐτῶν τὸ κάλλιον ἐξελέξαντο! Καὶ κατ-
εδαπανήθη τὸ ἑλληνικὸν κλέος εἰς πολέμους ἀρπακτικούς, καὶ προσευχὰς
ἀνοσίας ἀφ' ὧν ὁ Κύριος τελικῶς τὸ βλέμμα ἀπέστρεψε! Καὶ ἐσπάρησαν
τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὰ σώματα ὅπου μόνον *προσκαίρως ἐνεφύει ἐγγενῶς ἀσθε-
νὴς ὁ πολιτισμός*, διότι ἄγωνα περὶ τὴν μακρὰν αὐτοῦ καλλιέργειαν ἦσαν
πάντα κείμενα τὰ χῶματα, τῆς Ἑλλάδος (τε καὶ τοῦ κόσμου) ἀδίκως οὕτω
στερηθείσης τοῦ μὴ πλείονας Ἑλλήνας γεννήσαντος σώματος καὶ μὴ μεί-
ζον' ἔτι πολιτισμὸν δημιουργήσαντος πνεύματος τῶν ἀρίστων αὐτῆς τέκ-
νων πεσόντων ἐπὶ ματαίῳ ἐνθάδε τε καὶ μακράν! Καὶ ἐστείρευσεν τὸ ἑλληνι-
κὸν πνεῦμα πάσης ἔσωθιν, αὐτοφνοῦς, δημιουργικῆς τοῦ μέλλοντος παρορ-
μήσεως, ἐπ' αἰῶνας πλέον μακροῦς ἀκολουθοῦν ἄλλους, ἀλλὰ μὴ πλέον κατα-
νοοῦν (διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐπὶ τῷ ἀκατανοήτῳ ἡμῖν παρελθόντι προσήλωσιν,
οὗτινος τὴν ἰδίαν περὶ τῆς μέλλοντος δημιουργίας κινητήριον ἀντίληψιν-
δύναμιν ἀπωλέσαμεν) τὴν πνευματικὴν οὐσίαν τῆς παρ' ἄλλων ἔτι *συνεχι-
ζομένης* δημιουργικῆς προσπάθειας τὸν *εὐγενῆ* ἧς σκοπὸν οἱ Ἕλληνες πρῶ-
τοι ὑπέδειξαν! [Καὶ νῦν, *περιορίσαντες* τὸ πεδίου τῆς ἡμετέρας ὁράσεως,

ἀδυνατοῦντες ἰδεῖν τὸ σύνολον καὶ σκοπὸν τῆς παγκοσμίου δημιουργίας, μαθάνοντες περὶ τῶν ἀλλαχού γιγνομένων διὰ τοῦ καθημερινοῦ τύπου γραφομένου παρ' ἀνθρώπων περὶ τῶν συνήθων καθημερινῶν μόνων πραγμάτων συλλεγόντων πληροφορίας, ἀκούοντες μόνους τοὺς παρ' ἡμῖν ταῦτα δῆθεν "ἐξηγοῦντας" ἡμῖν, δοκοῦμεν ὅτι καὶ πάντες οἱ ἄλλοι τυρβάζουσι περὶ μόνὰ τὰ μέσα, ὥς γε ποιοῦμεν ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ξένης εἰσάγοντες μόνὰ τὰ μέσα, οὐ καὶ τὸν κείνων σκοπὸν! Διὰ τοῦτο, διότι περὶ χρημάτων ὁ καθημερινὸς λόγος, κατὰ τὸ παρὸν ἡμῶν μέτρον δοκοῦμεν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους περὶ αὐτῶν μόνον πονοῦντας! Παρορώμεν ὅτι τὰ καθ' ἡμέραν ἀναγκαίως ὑπ' ὀλίγων διακινούμενα χρήματα οὐκ ἔστι τῶν "ὀλίγων" ἀλλὰ τῶν πολλῶν, ὅτι οἱ "ὀλίγοι" οὐ διακυβεύουσι τὰς οὐσίας αὐτῶν ἀλλὰ μικρὸν μόνον αὐτῶν μέρος, εἴ πως τοῦτο ποιοῦσιν, ὅτι τὸ σύνολον τῶν παρ' αὐτῶν πως διακυβευομένων ἐλάχιστον μέρος μόνον ἔστι τῶν ποσῶν περὶ ὧν ἀκούομεν καθ' ἡμέραν! Ἀγνοοῦμεν ὅτι ἀβεβαίου ὄντος τοῦ μέλλοντος, οἱ ἀλλαχού σώφρονες σωφρόνως ἐμπιστεύονται τὰς οἰκονομίας αὐτῶν ἐπαίουσιν, οὐχ ὥς ἡμεῖς τῷ "κράτει", παρ' οὗ μόνου, πάντως τούτῳ μονίμως ἐνατιούμενοι, ἡμεῖς ἀναμένομεν τὴν περὶ πάντων φροντίδα, ἀτερμόνως πλείον' ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἀπαιτοῦντες, κὰν πλείονων δι' ὀκνηρίαν οὐ δικαιώμεθα! Ἀγνοοῦμεν ὅτι ἵνα εὐδοκιμήσῃ, ὁ πολιτισμὸς ἀπαιτεῖ ἄνεσιν πνεύματος ἀπὸ μεριμνῶν, ὅτι πένητες πολιτισμὸν οὐ παράγουσιν, ὅτι χοῖ Ἕλληνες οἱ ἀρχαῖοι διὰ τῆς τοιαύτης ἀνέσεως οὐ τῆς πείνης παρήγαγον τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν ὥς χοῖ σημερινοὶ παραγωγοὶ τοῦ πολιτισμοῦ, οὓς μεμφόμεθα, χλευάζομεν καὶ φθοноῦμεν διὰ τὸν δῆθεν "ἀνούσιον" αὐτῶν βίον, καθ' οὗ ἡμεῖς "εὐφυῶς" ἀντιπαράθεμεν τὸν πλήρη "οὐσίας" ἡμέτερον, καταδαπανώμενον ἀντὶ δημιουργίας ἐπὶ ταπεινά!]

Διὰ τοῦτο φεῦ γεγόνασι παρ' ἡμῖν, καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ τῶν αὐχένων ἡμῶν κάθηντ' ἀπρόσκλητοι, ἄκρως ἀνόητοι δῆθεν πνευματικοί, Ὁρθόδοξ' ἀρχιερεῖς, ἡγέται μικροί, καθηγηταὶ οὐδὲν καινόν, ἴδιοι, καθ' ὑποκλοπὴν μόνην "παράγοντες", πάντες σοφισταὶ καὶ δημαγωγοί, ὑπὸ τῆς Ἱστορίας οὐδὲν διδασθέντες, παρακινούμενοι (διὰ τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς δῆθεν ἀγάπην πλὴν μετ' αἰγίστου, παρὰ τὰ φαινόμενα καὶ λεγόμενα, κατ' ἁλλοδόξων καὶ τοῦ ὥσει ὄμφακος αὐτοῖς "δυτικοῦ" πολιτισμοῦ περισσοῦ μίσους ὑπερχειλίζοντος ἀπὸ τῶν ἀκαταπαύστως ἀπὸ ὥτὸς ἕως ὥτὸς μειδιώντων χειλέων αὐτῶν, τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἐν ὑψίστοις θρηνοῦντος ἐπὶ τῷ θεάματι τῶν ἀνθρώπων) τοὺς οὓς αὐθ' οὗτοι κατέλιπον ἀπαιδεύτους εἰς "ὁράματα" φροῦδα βαρβαρικῶν ἀνατολικῶν καὶ βαλκανικῶν κατακτήσεων, ὧν τὰς τρομακτικὰς συνεπείας ἀρνηθέντες διὰ νωχέλειαν πνεύματος προῖδεῖν νῦν καθορώμεν! Οὓς παρακινούσιν οἱ ἄφρονες χάριν, ὥς ἀσέμνως ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ αἰτιολογοῦσι τὰς τοιαύτας "ποιμεινικὰς" αὐτῶν παροτρύνσεις, τῆς ἀφ' ὕπνου διεγέρσεως καὶ τροφῆς τοῦ "πατριωτικοῦ καὶ ὀρθοδόξου θρησκευτικοῦ" αἰσθήματος, οὐκ ἐλλόγου φρονήματος, τῶν Ἑλλήνων, νῦν δὲ καὶ τῶν "ἀδελφῶν" ἡμῶν Σέρβων, οὓς παροτρύνοντες ἡλιθίως εἰς μείζονα βυθίζουσιν ὄλεθρον!

Πὼς θρασύτατα κατατάσσουσι καὶ με, μὴ ἐρωτήσαντες, μετὰ βλασφημῶν σκοταδιστῶν, ("Ὁρθόδοξων"!) βαρβάρων, πυρπολητῶν, ἐξολοθρευτῶν, βιαστῶν καὶ σφαγέων γερόντων, γυναικῶν καὶ νηπίων; Τόσον φεῦ ἀπέλιπε

παρ' ἡμῖν ἢ αἰδώς, κατέλαβεν ἡμᾶς παχηλὴ τῆς διδασκούσης Ἱστορίας ἢ ἄγνοια, ἀπεμακρύνθη ἀφ' ἡμῶν ἢ ὀρθὴ ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ πίστις, γιγαντεία κατέστη ἢ ὕβρις, ὥστε νῦν ἀδυνατῶμεν ἰδεῖν τὴν μεταξὺ *κακοποιοῦ καὶ τιμωροῦ* διαφορὰν; Κρίνον: (α) Ὅτιδήποτ' ἄρα ὁ πρῶτος δικαιούται ποιεῖν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν *δῆθεν* ἀπόλυτον αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ *μεσαιωνικὴν κατὰ τὰ ὡς ἄνω* κυριαρχίαν, *κἂν τὸ κακὸν ὑπερχειλίζῃ ἐπὶ τὰ ἔξω, ὅπου ἄλλους σιωπῶντας δεῖ αὐτοῦ ἐπιλήψεσθαι, πλήρως περὶ τοῦτο κείνου ἀδιαφοροῦντος*; (β) Τίνος ἄρ' οὖν εἰ ὑπηρέτης τοῦτο διατεινόμενος, τοῦ τυράννου ἢ τοῦ ὑπὸ κείνον λαοῦ; Ἔστιν ἄρ' ἀνωτέρα ἀρχὴ τὸ συνόρων ἀπαραβίαστον ἐν οἷς ὁ βούλεται ποιεῖ τύραννος, ἢ τὸ προστατεύειν λαὸν ὅλον ἀπὸ διωγμοῦ ἀσφαλῶς γιγνομένου ἐντὸς ἀπαραβίαστων συνόρων; Οἱ πολὺ λίαν κομπάζοντες περὶ ἀνθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων ὡς πολυτίμου συγχρόνου πολιτισμικῆς κατακτήσεως ἄρ' ἐκχωροῦσιν τυράννοις τὴν περὶ αὐτῶν μέριμναν, ἢ πολὺ μᾶλλον δεῖ αὐτοὺς μεριμνᾶν περὶ τῆς *ἀσφαλίσεως τούτων ἐκάστῳ ἀνθρώπῳ*; Πῶς καὶ ἀδιαφόρους ὡς ἄλλης τινὸς ἐποχῆς καὶ κομπάζοντας ὡς τῆς παρούσης περὶ ταῦτα ἐγκαταλείπει ἡμᾶς τελευτῶν ὁ παρὼν *πάντων αἵματηρότατος διὰ τοὺς κατ' αὐτὸν τυράννους* αἰών; Πῶς "συγχρόνους" ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς θεωροῦμεν οὐδὲν μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν *συγχρόνων* παθημάτων καὶ τῶν αἰτίων αὐτῶν μεμαθηκότας, πεισματικῶς δ' εἰς *ἰδέας παρωχημένας δῆθεν περὶ κυριαρχίας λαῶν, οὐσίᾳ ὅμως περὶ κυριαρχίας τυράννων καλῶς ὀπισθεν τῶν λαῶν αὐτῶν κρυπτομένων* ἐμμένοντας; Κομπάζοντες ὑπὲρ ἐλευθερίας, πῶς οὕτω *τυράννων ὑπήκοοι* παραμένομεν διατελοῦντες πειθήνι' αὐτῶν ὄργανα, *ἀφ' ἡμῶν μόνων "κρυπτόμενοι"* ὀπισθεν τῆς *φειάκης* τῆς "συλλογικῆς ἡμῶν ἀθωότητος ὡς λαοῦ"; Πῶς καὶ τυράννους *ἀσμένως* δεχόμεθα καὶ "ἐλευθέρους" ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς λέγομεν; Τοσούτως οὖν ἄρα φοβούμεθα τὴν *μεγάλην* ἐφ' ἐνὸς ἐκάστου ἡμῶν ἀκεραίως καταπίπτουσιν ἐλευθερίας εὐθύνην ὥστ' ἀποδέχεσθαι τύραννον *ἔν' ἐπ' αὐτοῦ προσάπτωμεν ταύτην*; Πῶς ἀφ' ἡμῶν διαφεύγει ὅτι περὶ ἄλλων ἐνδιατρίβοντες *μάλα πλείονα περὶ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν λέγομεν, ἀφεύκτως ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς ἔχοντες μέτρον*; Ἀληθῶς φοβερὰ ἐρωτήματα ταῦτα, *ἀνδρῶν οὐ μειράκων* ἀποκρίσεως χρῆζοντα! (γ) Ἄλλ' ἀκούω σε λέγοντα τίς ἐστὶν ὁ τιμωρὸς ὥστ' ἀπροσκλήτως "εἰσβάλη" τιμωρίαν ἐπιβαλεῖν; Ἄλλ' *αἰεὶ ὁ ἐκάστοτε ἰσχυρότερος*! Καὶ *σύ γε τοιοῦτος* ποτ' ἦν, *περὶ οὗ ἔτι ὑπερήφανος εἶ*; ἀσφαλῶς *οὐκ ἐλησμόνησας*! Διατί οὖν τὸν "κατάπληκτον" *προσποιούμεθα*; Ἄρα λησμονοῦμεν ὅτι *κατὰ παρέκκλισιν ἀπὸ τοῦ προηγηθέντος "δικαίου"* οἱ ποτ' ἰσχυροὶ ἐγκατέστησαν καὶ τὸ νῦν καλούμενον "διεθνὲς δίκαιον"; Ἐὰν δὲ δικαιῶνται τὰ ἔθνη ἀναθεωρεῖν τὰ ἐσωτερικὰ αὐτῶν "δίκαια", διατὶ ἄρα δεῖ ἐξαιρεῖσθαι τὸ διεθνὲς ὡς αἱ νέαι περιστάσεις χό ἐκάστοτ' ἰσχυρότερος ἐπιβάλλουσι; Πῶς σοβαρῶς λέγομεν ὅτι τὰ ἔθνη δεῖ διοικεῖσθαι, οὐχὶ δ' ὅμως καὶ σύμπας ὁ κόσμος; Ἔστι κόσμου διοίκησις ἢ περὶ αὐτῆς ὅλως *ἰδιοτελής, ἀνερμάτιστος* *κἂς οὐδὲν ἀπολήγουσ' ἀτέρμων κενολογία δῆθεν περὶ "ἀρχῶν"*, ἐν ἣ *αἰσχροῦς* *δημαγωγοῦντες* *πρωτεύομεν*, ἢ πολὺ μᾶλλον ἢ διοικήσεως *πράξεις*, καθ' ἣν, τῶν "ἀρχῶν" στεργῶς τεθεισῶν, οἱ ἄνθρωποι *χωροῦσιν εἰς τὴν κατ' ἀξίαν ὑπηρεσίαν αὐτῶν αἰεὶ καθορῶντες* τὸ δι' αὐτῶν *σαφῶς καθορισθὲν τέλος οἰκονομίας*; Ἐὰν δὲ δεχώμεθα ὅτι *κατὰ πλειοψηφίαν* *πλὴν ἀνευ ἀδικίας* δεῖ "ἐσωτερικῶς" διοικεῖσθαι τὰ ἔθνη, πῶς

ἄρα λέγομεν ὅτι οὐχ οὕτως ὁμοίως ἀλλὰ κατὰ πλήρη ὁμοφωνίαν δεῖ διοικεῖσθαι τὸν κόσμον; Ἀγνοοῦμεν ὅτι τοῦ συνόλου αὐξανομένου μειοῦται ἡ πιθανότης ἐπιτεύξεως πλήρους ὁμοφωνίας; Μὴν ἄρ' οὖν ἡ ἡμετέρα ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἐμμονὴ διάτρητός ἐστι πρόφασις, ἢν' ἀπεριορίστως ἀδιοίκητος παραμείνῃ ὁ κόσμος ὅταν οἱ μειοψηφοῦντες ἀπαρέσκωνται τῷ πλειοψηφούντι, ὅς ἐπιβάλλεται μόνον ἂν καὶ ἰσχυρότερος ᾖ; Ἀλλὰ πῶς καὶ τοιαῦτα διατεινόμεθα, διὰ γε κακίαν οὐκ ἄρετήν, καὶ δημοκράτας ἑαυτοὺς λέγομεν; (δ) Μὴν ἀκούω σε λέγοντα· τὸν τιμωρὸν τίς ἐκάλεσεν; Ἀλλὰ σοβαρῶς, ἡ καταγέλαστοι, λέγομεν ὅτι ἀσμένως καλεῖ τις τὸν αὐτοῦ τιμωρὸν; (ε) Ὑπερέβαλε νῦν τῆς κακοποιίας εἰς τιμωρίαν ὁ τιμωρός, ἄδικος καταστάς; Ἀρ' ἐσταθμισάμεθα τὸ πᾶσι πλὴν ἡμῖν ἐμφανέστατον κακοποιοῦ ἄδικον; Ἡ ἄρ' ἐνεκύψαμεν ἐπὶ τῷ μικροσκοπῷ ἐρεύνης τῶν καρδιῶν κακοποιοῦ τε καὶ τιμωροῦ καὶ δικαίως ὑπὲρ τοῦ πρώτου καὶ κατὰ τοῦ δευτέρου ἀποφαινόμεθα, συντασσόμενοι καὶ περὶ τὰ διεθνή ὡς καὶ περὶ τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς κακοποιοῖς μᾶλλον ἢ τῇ ἀστυνομίᾳ ἣν ἀπρεπῶς καθυβρίζομεν, "μεγάλην πολιτισμικὴν πρόοδον" θεωροῦντες τὴν τοιαύτην μηδενιστικὴν ἡμῶν "πολιτείαν"; Πῶς κατὰ μόνην τὴν "αἴσθησιν", ἀποδείξεων ἄνευ, μονομερῶς οὐκ ἀμφιμερῶς, κατηγοροῦμεν μόνον τὸν τιμωρὸν δι' "ἐπιβουλὰς" δεῖ παρ' ἡμῶν ἀσαφῶς ὑπαινισσομένας, οὐδέποτε δηλουμένας, ἐπιμελῶς πλὴν διὰ μόνην τὴν κακίαν ἡμῶν ἀποφεύγοντες κρίνειν καὶ τὰς τοῦ κακοποιοῦ πράξεις, κοῦκ ἐσμέν ταπεινοὶ συκοφάνται; Ἐὰν κακοποιοῖς ἀρεσκώμεθα, ὡς ἥρωας τιμῶμεν αὐτούς, χῶς "λαϊκὰς" ἀνδραγαθίας τὰ ἔργ' αὐτῶν ἐπαινώμεν, κατὰ τό γε νῦν κρατοῦν ἡμῶν ἔθος, τίτι παγκοσμίῳ δικαίῳ ἡμεῖς ἀπαιτοῦμεν καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἄλλους ὁμοίως ποιεῖν; Ἐχομεν ἐλαχίστην ἔστω ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ βάρους τῆς συκοφαντίας αὐτῆς καὶ τί αὐτὴ κατ' ἀνάγκην ἀδήριτον καθ' ἡμῶν τέξεται, τυφλῶς ἀρνούμενων προσμετρεῖν τὸ πρὸ ἡμῶν μέγα κατὰ γυναικῶν καὶ νηπίων καὶ λαοῦ ὅλου κακούργημα τῆς ἀφαιρέσεως τροφῆς, στέγης, πατρίδος, τῶν ἐπιβουλευομένων τὴν γῆν καὶ τοὺς πόρους αὐτῆς; Πῶς δ' ἀποφευξόμεθα τῆς δεινοτάτης πιθανῆς εἰκασίας ἂν μὴ καὶ κατηγορίας ὅτι κατ' ἀδήλωτον πλὴν ἀσίγητον ἐπιθυμίαν ψυχῆς συντασσόμεθα τοῖς τοιαῦτα ποιοῦσι καθ' ὧν χῆμεῖς θεωροῦμεν ἡμετέρους ἐχθροὺς καθ' ὧν ὅμοια οὐ τολμῶμεν ποιεῖν; (ς) Σκοπίμως, ὡς ἐπιμένομεν, ἐπ' "ἀθῶων" ὁ τιμωρὸς ἐπιρρίπτει τὰς βόμβας; Τίνα τούτου [ὑπὲρ ποιοῦμεν κατὰ τὸ ἐν τῷδε τόπῳ ἐνδημοῦν βυρσοδομοῦν μὴ δ' ἐκριζοῦμενον ἡμῶν κάκιστον ἔθος] ὡς ἐπὶ δικαστηρίῳ ἀποδεκτὴν ἀπόδειξιν ἔχομεν, ἵνα μὴ κατηγορηθῶμεν ἐνώπιον τοῦ κόσμου παντὸς ὡς αἰσχρότατοι συκοφάνται; Γινώσκουμεν τί ὁ νόμος κατὰ συκοφαντῶν διατάσσει; (ζ) Νέου, "βαρβάρου" εἵδους ἔστιν οὗτος ὁ πόλεμος; Ἀπλῶς νέου εἵδους! Διὰ τοὺς ἡττωμένους πάντες οἱ πόλεμ' εἰσὶ βάρβαροι! Ἐξ ἀποστάσεως "ἀνάνδρως" βάλλει ὁ τιμωρός; Ἰδὲ τὸν λέγοντα! Ἀλλὰ τί ἀληθῶς λέγεις; Ὅτι δεῖ νῦν ἡμᾶς καταργεῖν ὡς καὶ βέλη; Τόλμησον σὺ ὁ "ἀνδρεῖος" εἰπεῖν τοῦτο τοῖς βέλη κατέχουσιν! Ἀπλῶς τοιοῦτος νῦν ἔστιν ὁ πόλεμος! Καὶ σὺ εἰ ἐδύνω τοιοῦτον αὐτὸν ἂν ἐποίεις! Ἀφες οὖν τὴν προσποίησιν! Ἀπὸ μεγάλης ἀποστάσεως πλήττει ὁ τιμωρός; Ἄρα χρόνος παρέρχεται ἕως τῆς πλήξεως, κάπροσδόκητα δύναται ἕως τῆς πλήξεως ἐπὶ τοῦ σημείου τῆς πλήξεως, οὐχ οὕτως ὄντος ἀναγκαίως καὶ στόχου συμβαίνειν! Μό-

νας ἄς συμφέρει αὐτῷ πληγὰς δεχομένης ὁ πληττόμενος κακοποιὸς ἐπιδείκνυσιν, τὸν οἶκτον τῶν θεατῶν καὶ τοῦ τιμωροῦ προσπαθῶν διεγείρει· οὐδεμίαν ὅμως ὦν αὐτὸς ἐπιφέρει κατὰ τῶν μᾶλλον ἀσθενεστέρων, περὶ ὧν οὐδὲν λέγει, ὦν ἔνεκα κατ' αὐτοῦ ἐπῆλθεν ὁ τιμωρός! Πῶς ἄρα δυνάμεθα (εἴτε ὁ τιμωρός, εἴτε οἱ θεαταί) δικαίως σταθμίσαι ποινὴν πρὸς ἀδίκημα; Ἄλλ' ἔστι καὶ τοῦτο: Λέγεις ὅτι ἐνετάθησαν οἱ διωγμοὶ κατὰ τῶν μᾶλλον ἀσθενεστέρων μετὰ τὴν ἐπιβολὴν τῆς ποινῆς, χῶτι ἄρ' ἀτελέσφορός ἐστιν αὕτη; Τίς εἰ οὐχ ὁ κακοποιὸς ὁ δεχόμενος τὰς πληγὰς δύνατ' ἄρα σταθμίσαι τὴν τελεσφόρησιν; Ὡς οὖν αὐτὸς ἐμμένει ἐπὶ τῷ ἔργῳ αὐτοῦ, δι' ὃ καὶ πλείονας πληγὰς δέχεται, ἄρα σταθμίζει ὅτι καλῶς ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ μέχρι τοῦδ' ὁ πόλεμος βαίνει! "Ἀρα, ἡ ἐπιβαλλομένη ποινὴ λογικῶς κρινομένη παρ' ἀμφοτέρων κακοποιου τε καὶ τιμωροῦ σαφῶς ὑπολείπεται τοῦ ἔτι διαπραττομένου ἐγκλήματος! Πῶς οὖν ἡμεῖς, μονομερεῖς τε καὶ θεαταί, παρατηροῦντες οὐκ ἀσφαλῶς ἐξ ἀσφαλοῦς ἀποστάσεως, λέγομεν διάφορα φλύαρα περὶ τῆς "ἀδικίας" τῆς ἐπιβαλλομένης ποινῆς; Ὅτε δ' ἐν μέσῳ καὶ τῇ ὄψει φλογῶν, αἵματος καὶ καιομένων ἀνθρωπίνων σαρκῶν ὀργανοῦνται χυδαῖοι, ἀνηθικοὶ, δῆθεν πεπολιτισμένοι "ἑορτασμοὶ"-προκλήσεις ἐπ' αὐτοθυσίαν ὑπὸ τῶν Σέρβων, ἔτι διὰ τῆς ἄλλης αὐτῶν χειρὸς ποιούντων τάποτρόπαιον ἔγκλημα, καὶ δῆθεν "καλλιτεχνικαὶ ἐκδηλώσεις" ὑπὸ Σερβοφίλων πρὸς ὑπεράσπισιν τοῦ γιγνομένου ἐγκλήματος, πῶς δεῖ πάντα τὸν μὴ κατανοῦντα τὸν καινὸν τοῦτον βαλκανικὸν "τρόπον" κακοποιῶν τε καὶ φίλων ἐρμηνεύσαι τὸ δωρεὰν παρεχόμενον ἀνθήκον θέαμα καὶ τὴν τούτων ἐκτίμησιν τοῦ ὅλου προβλήματος; Πῶς ἢ ὅτι ἡ μὲν ποινὴ, παρ' ὅτι ἀναμφιβόλως κάπι γνωστῶς βαρεῖα, οὐκέτι ἐστὶν ἱκανή, τινὲς δὲ τῶν βαλκανίων νέα βάρβαρ' ἦθη παρουσιάζουσι τῷ λοιπῷ κόσμῳ μηδέποτε λησμονήσαντι ὅτι ὁ πόλεμος οὐδέποτε ἔπαυσεν εἶναι μᾶλλον καὶ μᾶλλον σοβαροτάτη ὑπόθεσις λογικῆς μόνης χρήσεως δεομένη, οὐχὶ δέ τι παραλόγων βαρβάρων ἀναλώσιμον θέαμα, χρωμένων μὲν τῶν νέων "πολιτιστικῶν καὶ τεχνικῶν κατακτήσεων" ἀλλ' ὅμως οὐδέποτε ἀποβαλόντων τᾶς Λογ' αὐτῶν μεσαιωνικὰ ἦθη, καὶ διὰ τοῦτ' ἀδυνατούντων κατανοῆσ' ὅτι νῦν ἤδη ἥλλαξεν ὡς καὶ τὴν ἡ περὶ "δικαίου", διεθνοῦς συμπεριφορᾶς, καὶ πολέμου ὅλη ἀντίληψις; (η) Ἄλλ' ἀμφοτέρωθεν "ἀθῶοι" ὑπάρχοντες πλήττονται; Ἀναμφιβόλως ἀθῶοι ὑπάρχουσιν ἀμφοτέρωθεν. Ἄλλ' ἀληθῶς ἐστὶν ἀθῶος ὁ μὴ συνεργῶν ὀφελούμενος ἢ ὀφεληθησόμενος; Τί ἄρ' οὖν εἵπομεν καὶ περὶ συνεργούντων; Νέος ὁ παρὼν πόλεμος! "Ἀοπλοι γυμνοὶς σώμασι στρατιωτικοὺς στόχους ὑπερασπίζονται! "Ἀρα τοῦ πολέμου μετέχουσι! "Ἀοπλοι μὲν εἰσὶν, ἄμαχοι δ' ὅμως οὐκ εἰσὶν! Ὡς ὅπλον μετέρχονται τὸ ἑαυτῶν "ἄοπλον"! Ἐν τῷ παρόντι πολέμῳ τὸ ἄοπλον καὶ τὸ ἄμαχον οὐκ ἐστὶ συνώνυμα, καὶ ποινῶς μόνον συγχέεται! "Ἡ μὴν ἄρ' ὁ μονάρχης διὰ τῆς ἰδίας αὐτοῦ χειρὸς τὸ πρωτογενὲς κακὸν ἐπιβάλλει, οὐ δὲ διὰ τῶν χειρῶν τῶν δῆθεν ἀθῶων αὐτοῦ ὑπηκόων τῶν ἄσβεστον κατ' ἀλλήλων ἐν ταῖς ἰδίαις ψυχαῖς τηρησάντων τὸ μῖσος, αὐτοῦ μὲν ἀεὶ "καθαράς" αἵματος διατηροῦντος κάπικαλουμένου τὰς ἰδίας αὐτοῦ χεῖρας, αὐτῶν δὲ κρινομένων "ἀθῶων" ὡς (δῆθεν ἀβούλου) λαοῦ; Πῶς οὖν ἄρα Λογικῶς λέγομεν ὅτι πάντες αὐτοὶ "ἀθῶοι" εἰσὶν, ἔνοχος δὲ μόνος ὁ τιμωρός; Μὴν οὐ καὶ τέκνα πλήττουσιν ἁμαρτίαι γονέων, ἐν αἷς καὶ τὸ διὰ γενεῶν μῖσος;

Τίς ἄρ' εὐθύνεθ' ὅταν αὐτ' οὐ παιδεύωσιν ἀλλὰ γαλουχῶσιν; Ἄλλ' ἔστι καὶ τοῦτο: Σοβαρῶς ἢ καταγέλαστοι λέγομεν ὅτι πρὸ τῆς ὑπὸ τῶν "Δυτικῶν" ἀπ' ἀέρος ἐπιβαλλομένης "παρανόμου" ποινῆς πρόσφυγες οὐχ ὑπῆρχον; Διὰ μὲν τὸ ἔμμεσον δι' αὐτὴν ὑπάρξει αὐτῶν τούτῳ δεῖ ἡμᾶς ἀποκρίνεσθαι: ὅτι Ἄρα δικαιούται ὁ διὰ "παρανόμου" ποινῆς "ἀδικούμενος" *κατὰ πλεον ἄσθε-νεστέρων ἐπισπᾶν τὴν ἐκδίκησιν*; Διὰ δὲ τὸ ἄμεσον αὐτῶν δι' αὐτὴν, τούτῳ: ὅτι Ἄρα προσφεύγει τις τῷ κείνου διώκτῃ, ἢ τῷ αὐτοῦ φίλῳ; ὅτι Ἄρα παραφρονήσαντες οἱ πρόσφυγες οὐ γινώσκουσι ποῦ προσφεύγειν κοῦ προσφεύγουσιν εἰς μόνους ἡμᾶς ἀεὶ ἱκανοὺς ὑποδείξει αὐτοῖς τε καὶ πᾶσι τίς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀληθὴς αὐτῶν φίλος; Τίς οὖν ἀληθῶς παρεφρόνησε; (θ) *Μὴ ἔχοντες πλήρη τῶν πραγμάτων εἰκόνα, μὴ σπεύδοντες τοιαύτην λαβεῖν, ἀρνούμενοι διαρρήδην ταῦτα πάντα συνυπολογίσει, κρίνοντες ἀπὸ τυφλοῦ πάθους πολλαπλῶς τε καὶ πονηρῶς ἠθελημένης πλην ἀνομολογήτου μονομερείας* τὰ πράγματα, τολμῶμεν ἐγείρειν τὸν ζυγὸν τῆς ἀδεκάστου Θεῆς δικαιοσύνης καὶ καταδικάζομεν οὓς δι' ἄλλοδοξίαν καὶ τὸ ὑπὸ ταύτην κρυπτόμενον θρησκευτικὸν τεχνιέντως κακουργούμενοι μῖσος θέλομεν ὑποπτεῦσεσθ' ὥς, οὐχὶ οὓς καθορώμεν ἀλλὰ τυφλῶς δι' ὁμοδοξίαν μεγαλοφύχως μόν' ἡμεῖς συγχωροῦμεν, πρῶτους ἄδικα πράξαντας; Τίνες ἐπὶ τέλους ἐσμέν οὕτως, εὐκόλως "συγχωρεῖν" ἀδικήματα κατὰ τρίτων; Μόνῳ τῷ πληττομένῳ ἔξεστιν ἢ τοιαύτη τιμή! Ἡμεῖς ὑποχρεούμεθ' ἴστασθαι μάρτυρες ἀψευδεῖς πάντων τῶν γιγνομένων! (ι) Δικαιοῦται κακοποιὸς ἀπαιτεῖν παῦσιν τῆς τιμωρίας *ἄνευ προηγουμένης καταπαύσεως τῆς παρ' αὐτοῦ ἀρξαμένης καὶ συνεχιζομένης ἀδικίας τῆς ὁδηγησάσης τὴν χεῖρα τοῦ τιμωροῦ*; Δικαιοῦται τις ἀπαιτεῖν ἄρσιν τῆς τιμωρίας *ἄνευ τινὸς μετανοίας*; Πῶς ἐστὶν αὕτη "Ὁρθόδοξος" ἐπὶ Θεῷ πίστις, ἣν ἀναισχύντως ἐπιδείκνυμεν τοῖς λαοῖς γόν' ἡμεῖς φιλοσόφων, καὶ τίνος τιμῆς ἣν ἀπαιτοῦμεν θρασέως διὰ κληρονομίαν ἣν ἡμεῖς οὐδόλως σεβόμεθ' ἐσμέν οὕτως ἄξιοι; Πῶς, "ἠθικῆς" ἣν ἐπικαλούμεθ' ἕνεκα, μόνην τὴν τιμωρίαν θεωροῦμεν ἀνῆθικον, οὐχ ὅμως δὲ καὶ τὴν ταύτην προκαλέσασαν πρᾶξιν; Τὴν ζωὴν ἡμῶν πάντες οἱ ἐπὶ γῆς καταστήσαντες *θάλασσαν αἵματος*, ὅπου ὥς ἰχθύες οἱ μείζονες κατατρώγουσι τοὺς ἐλάσσονας, πῶς δικαιούνται οἱ μέσου μεγέθους διαμαρτύρεσθαι; *Διὰ τί ἀρνούμεθ' ἀφιέναι τὴν κρίσιν τοῦ μεγίστου ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ ταύτῃ "ἰχθύος"* αὐτῷ τῷ Δικαίῳ Θεῷ, ἐφ' ᾧ *ἀνευθριάστως* λέγομεν ὅτι Ὁρθόδοξως πιστεύομεν;

Ἀληθῶς γὰρ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, οὐχ αἵματος, ἣν ἡ Βαλκανικὴ πρὸ τῆς "ἀπροσκλητοῦ καὶ παρανόμου τῶν Δυτικῶν ὑπανθρώπων" ἐπελεύσεως ἐν αὐτῇ; Πῶς ὁ κ. Χριστόδουλος (ἀλλ' *ἱκανῶς* διὰ τοῦτον μόνον τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ *οὐ* Χριστοῦ δοῦλος! οὐδ' ὅμως καὶ Θεοῦ δοῦλος, ὅτι ὁ Κύριος, ἐν τῷ Κείνῳ ὀνόματι, ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ, οὐ δούλους ἡμᾶς ἀπεκάλεσεν! ὅπερ ὄνομα *ἱκανῶς* κατὰ ταῦτ' αὐτόχρημ' ἀνὸρθόδοξον ἀντιχριστιανικόν, κἂν δι' "εὐλάβειαν" ἐπινοηθὲν καταδείκνυται!) "χριστιανικῶς" λησμονεῖ(;) ὅτι *πᾶς αἱ μετὰ τὰς ἀρχαίας ἐν Βαλκανίοις τριβαὶ ἤρξαντ' ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἡμέρας τοῦ ἐν Κ/πόλει πατριαρχείου, τὸ ὅλον οὐ τι μερίδιον "χριστιανικῶς" ἀπαιτήσαντος τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς λαῶν κάδαφῶν τῶν μέχρι τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης "χριστιανικῶς" νεμομένων ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐν Ῥώμῃ*; Πρὸς τίνας ἐπὶ τέλους δοκεῖ ὅτι ὁμιλεῖ σήμερον; *Βυζαντινὸς* τῷ πνεύματι διαμείνας δοκεῖ ὅτι πάντες ἡμεῖς

ἀγνοοῦμεν τὴν Ἱστορίαν, ἢ ἀδυνατοῦμεν διαχωρίσαι τὰ αἰτιατὰ ἀπὸ τῶν αἰτίων αὐτῶν; Οὐχ ὁ Χριστὸς *ρήτῳς ἀπηγόρευσε* τὸ ἐπιτιθέναι φορτία βαρέα, δυσβάστακτα ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων τῶν ἀνθρώπων· τὸ ποιεῖν ἔργα πρὸς τὸ θε-
αθῆναι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις· τὸ πλατύνειν τὰ φυλακτήρια· τὸ μεγαλύνειν τὰ κράσπεδα τῶν ἱματίων· τὸ φιλεῖν τὴν πρωτοκλισίαν ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις καὶ τὰς πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς καὶ τοὺς ἀσπασμούς ἐν ταῖς ἀγο-
ραῖς· [ἄρ' οὖν καὶ τὸ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ δέχεσθ' *ἀναισχύντως* χειροφιλήματ' ἐπὶ χειρῶν *δῆθεν* ἀσκητικῶν *ὡς* *κἀπὸ τρυφερῶν χειλέων παρθένων*]· τὸ καλεῖν τινὰ καὶ καλεῖσθ' ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ῥαββί, διδάσκαλον, καθηγητήν, ὡς καὶ *πατέρ'* ἐπὶ γῆς [ὅπερ *ἀναισχύντως* τὸ *δῆθεν* "χριστιανικὸν" ἱερατεῖον περι-
εφρόνησεν *ἐπιτρέψαν* *κάξιοῦν* τίτλους εἰς βαθμὸν ὑπερθετικὸν ἵνα θρασύτα-
τα μέχρις ἐβδόμου οὐρανοῦ ἀναγάγῃ τὴν ὕβριν]· τὸ κατεσθίειν τὰς οἰκίας χηρῶν· τὸ προσεύχεσθαι προφάσει μακρά [ὅπερ σύγχρονος θεολόγος-φιλό-
σοφος-καθηγητῆς, "μετ' ἀνιάτου νοοτροπίας διδασκάλου", ἐν ὀνόματι *δῆ-
θεν* τῆς Ἑλλάδος καὶ τοῦ Ὀρθοδόξου Χριστιανισμοῦ, ἐπιθυμεῖ ἡμᾶς προβάλλ-
ειν ὡς "σύνθημα" (sic) τοῖς ξένοις (προφανῶς οὐδὲν κατ' αὐτὸν γινώσκου-
σι περὶ Ἑλλάδος τε καὶ Χριστιανισμοῦ!) ὡς τὴν "ὀργανικὴν καὶ ζωντανὴν
συνέχειαν τῆς ἀρχαίας ἑλληνικῆς τραγωδίας"!]
τὸ κλείειν τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων· τὸ περιάγεσθαι ξηράν τε καὶ θάλασ-
σαν πρὸς τὸ ποιεῖν ἓνα προσήλυτον καὶ μεταποιεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς υἱὸν γεέννης διπλοτέρου· τὸ καθαίρειν τὸ ἔξωθεν καὶ γέμειν τὸ ἔσωθεν ἀρπαγῆς καὶ ἀ-
κρασίας· τὸ φαίνεσθ' ἔξωθεν δικαίους, εἶναι δ' ἔσωθεν μεστοὺς ἀνομίας καὶ ὑποκρίσεως; Τί τούτων ἐστὶν ὅπερ οὐκ ἐποίησαν οἱ ἄνδρες τῆς ἐκκλησίας, *ἐαυτοὺς ἡμῖν ἐπιβαλόντες οὐ παρ' ἡμῶν ἐν νηστείᾳ καὶ προσευχῇ Πνεύμα-
τι Ἀγίῳ ἐπιλεγέντες*, ἀλλήλους θανασίμως μισοῦντες, ἀλλήλους ὡς ὑπαν-
θρώπους κατηγοροῦντες οἱ τὸν Χριστὸν "διδάσκοντες" τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ὣν
τὸ κατ' ἀλλήλων μῖσος κρυπτόμενοι *ὅπισθεν δῆθεν ἐθνικῶν διαφορῶν περι-
λαμβανουσῶν καὶ τὸ θρήσκειμ' ἐξάπτουσιν ἐμπαθέστατα οἱ ἀσύστολοι*, οὓς
παντὶ τρόπῳ ἕως τοῦ νῦν παρωθοῦσιν εἰς *ἐμπρησμούς, σφαγὰς καὶ πολέ-
μους*, χάριν *δῆθεν* τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν πίστεως, οὐσίᾳ ὅμως χάριν τῆς κατο-
χῆς καὶ νομῆς ἐδαφῶν, *χρὶν αὐτοί, οὐχὶ δ' ἄλλοι*, κάθωνται "πνευματικοὶ"
ἀνώτατοι ἄρχοντες αὐτοβαλλόμενοι ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων [οὐχὶ οὕτω πλέον διὰ τῆς
ἐπὶ καθαρῶς πνευματικῆς *ὁδηγήσεως*, ἀλλὰ διὰ μόνης τῆς κατὰ τὰ ὡς ἄνω
"ἡθοποιητικῆς *ἐκτελέσεως*" ὡς "ἐλλόγως ἀκατανοήτου" τραγωδίας τῆς θεί-
ας "δραματοουργίας"], οὓς ἀβυσσαλέως περιφρονοῦσι, παρ' ὧν "ἱστάμενοι
μεταξὺ Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων" ἀπαιτοῦσιν ὑποταγὴν ὡς προβάτων ἐπὶ σφαγὴν
καὶ τὸ χειροφίλημ' ὡς δούλων; *Τίνα τούτων ἔτι γιγνόμενα* κατήγγησεν ὁ κ.
Χριστόδουλος *πονηρότατα* τοιαῦτα διδάσκων; Ἡ ἄρα λησμονεῖ τὸ *πόθεν*
χρὺπτό ποίων ἐξ αἰτίας τῶν βαλκανίων παθῶν ἐν τῷ παρόντι αἰῶνι ὁ πρῶτος
παγκόσμιος πόλεμος ἤρξατο, ὁ *τοσαῦτα δεινὰ μέχρι καὶ τοῦδ' ὀρωμένου*
ἐνεγκῶν ἐφ' ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ, ἅτινα τοῦ αἰῶνος νῦν τελευτῶντος **came back home to roost** ἔτι *θρησκευτικῶς ὑποδαυλιζομέν' ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων ὡς αὐτὸς ἀπολύτως οὐδὲν διδαχθέντων*; Πῶς ἄρα τοιοῦτος, ἢ ἀκριβῶς ἄρα τοιοῦτος διὰ τὸ τοιοῦτος εἶναι ὑμᾶς, ἔπρεπεν ἡμῖν ἀρχιερεῦς;

Ἀληθῶς ὁ κ. Χριστόδουλος λησμονεῖ ὅτι *οὐδέποτε* ἐν Βαλκάνιοις ἔπαυ-

σαν αἱ σφαγαὶ μετὰ τὴν ἔλευσιν εἰς αὐτὰ τῶν Σλάβων καὶ τῶν Βουλγάρων οὐδέποτε παυσάντων ἐπιδιώκειν διαρπάσ' ἐδάφη ξένα, συνεχῶς νέα καὶ νοτιώτερα πέραν τῶν παραχωρηθέντων αὐτοῖς; Ἀληθῶς λησμονεῖ ὅτι ἡ κάθοδος τοῦλάχιστον ἕως Ὀλύμπου ἐστὶ παλαιότατον Σλαβικὸν ὄνειρον μέχρι τοῦ νῦν εὐλαβούμενον, δι' ὃ μάλα πόλλ' ἐπάθομεν ἕως καὶ πρὸ πεντήκοντα μόνον ἐτῶν τῶν ἐνταῦθα κείνων πρακτόρων συναπεργασθέντων τὴν ἐκείνοις παράδοσιν ἐθνικῶν ἡμῶν ἐδαφῶν, δι' ὃ καὶ προσφάτως αὐτῶν ἴδιον ἑλληνικὸν ἐποίησαν ὄνομα; Ἀληθῶς λησμονεῖ τί ὁ βάρβαρος Βουλγαροκτόνος ἐποίησε, κατελθὼν εἴτα ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας ἵν' ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕψους τοῦ Παρθενῶνος τῆς Παρθένου Ἀθηνᾶς-Θεονόης, αὐτῆς τουτέστι τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἀγίας Σοφίας, δῆθεν "προηγμένου" διὰ τῆς μετατροπῆς αὐτοῦ εἰς ναὸν τῆς Θεοτόκου, ὁ αἰμοσταγῆς ἀναπέμψῃ "Δοξολογίαν"; Ἀδελφοὶ ἀδελφοῖς, ἢ μόνοι "ἀδελφοὶ" "ἀδελφοῖς" τοιαῦτα ποιοῦσι, τῆς "Ἐκκλησίας" ἀεὶ εὐλογούσης; Ὡς οὖν ἀναιδέστατα νῦν μετὰ τῶν Σλάβων καὶ τῶν ἐνταῦθα μηδέποτε μετανοησάντων ἐκείνων πρακτόρων ἐμὲ μὲν ἀναγκάζει μνησθῆναι κείνων τῶν θλιβερῶν οὐχὶ διὰ μίσους, ἀλλὰ διὰ μόνην τὴν σύνεσιν, αὐτὸς δ' εὐθέως κηρύττει ὑπανθρώπους τοὺς "Δυτικούς" (πάντως μαθόντας τινὰ διὰ τῶν ἰδίων σφαλμάτων, ἐλθόντας δὲ νῦν προλαβεῖν καὶ περιορίσαι ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ πηγῇ καὶ τῷ τόπῳ αὐτῶν τάπικείμενα χεῖρονα, ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων σχεδιασθέντα καὶ ἐνεργούμενα, ἅπερ μᾶλλον χεῖρονα γίγνεται καθ' ἡμέραν, οὐχ ὅμως διὰ τὴν προρρηθεῖσαν μεθοδικήν—ἵνα μὴ μείζων τοῦ ἐλαχίστου ἀναγκαίου ὁ ὀλεθρος γένηται—τιμωρίαν τὴν λεγομένην ἀποτυχοῦσαν διὰ τὴν ἀρχικὴν αὐτῆς μαλακότητα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦ αὐτοκαταστροφικοῦ πείσματος τῶν ἐπιχωρίων μόνων, ὧν διανγεστάτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπιθυμία τὸ κακὸν διασπεῖρ' ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ παντὶ) τᾶσβεστον καὶ χεῖρον ἰοῦ ὀφews μίσους σταλάζων ἐν ψυχαῖς ἀνοήτων ὁ μηδέποτ' ἀποβαλὼν τὴν αἰμοσταγῇ βαλκάνιον-βυζαντινὴν ἡμετέραν "παράδοσιν" ἣν ἀγωνίζετ' ἐπανιδρύσαι, οὐδ' ἐπὶ στιγμὴν ὅμως σκεπτόμενος ἀπαλλάξ' ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχιεπισκοπικῆς Jaguar (ἢ Daimler;) ἐκ τῆς "μισητῆς Δύσεως" προϊούσης, οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ φιλτάτου αὐτοῦ Βυζαντίου τοῦ πεισματικῶς ἀρνηθέντος πέραν τῆς ὀνηλασίας προαγαγεῖν τὸν πολιτισμόν, ἄρ' ἀπὸ μόνου θρησκευτικοῦ μίσους κατὰ τῆς "Δύσεως" φέρεται, οὐκ ἐξ ἀγάπης, φιλανθρωπίας, ἢ ἔστω φιλοπατρίας, τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ "ποιμνίου" λείαν προσπαθῶν περισῶσαι ὥς ἔτι δύναται, ἥπερ διακυβεύεται (τῆς χώρας ἐν τῇ "Δύσει" πλήρως ἐντασσομένης) ἄνευ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ παντὶ δημοσίας σοβαρᾶς ἐργασίας, ἣν οὐδέποθ' ἡ Ὀρθόδοξος Ἐκκλησία κατέβαλλε περιοριζομένη εἰς μόνην τὴν νομὴν τοῦ κληρονομηθέντος "ποιμνίου"! Τί ἐπὶ τέλους ὠφέλιμον τοῖς ἀνθρώποις παρήγαγε τὸ Βυζάντιον; Ἐξηφανίσθη, ἀλλ' ἡ συντέλεια οὐκέτι ἐπῆλθεν! Ἄρα μείζονα παρ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεὸς ἀναμένει, ὥς ἡδη ἐλέχθη! Ποῦ ὅμως ἐστὶν ἡ παρ' αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἔτι βυζαντινῆς ἡμῶν Ἐκκλησίας προσεκτικὴ, ὥς ὁ Θεὸς θέλει αὐτήν, ἐτοιμασία Πολιτῶν Παραδείσου; Ἀληθῶς πιστεύει ὁ εὐφυὴς ὅτι οἱ ἐν τούτῳ καὶ παντὶ καθαρῷ τόπῳ ἀξέστωις ἀσελγούντες Ἕλληνες(;) Ὀρθόδοξοι(;) Χριστιανοί(;) τοῦ Παραδείσου ἀξιωθήσονται; Τί ἐμποδίζει αὐτοὺς κάκεῖ ποιεῖν ὥς ὧδε μανθάνουσι μακαρίως αὐτοῦ μειδιῶντος; Πόσους ἐπὶ τέλους Χριστιανούς ἐνσυνειδήτως, ὠργανομένως ἕως τοῦ νῦν παρήγαγε τὸ Βυζάντιον, καὶ πόσους ἢ ὑπάνθρωπος

Δύσις"; Τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἐκχριστιάνισιν τῶν Σλάβων θλιβερά διατρέξαντα καταγέγραπται! Ἡ ἐγκατάλειψις διὰ τὰσίγαστα θρησκευτικὰ βυζαντινὰ μίσση τῶν ἀσιατικῶν καὶ ἀφρικανικῶν τῆς αὐτοκρατορίας ἐπαρχιῶν γνωστὴ ἐστὶ πᾶσι πλὴν τοῖς ἠθελημένως τυφλοῖς! Αὕτη ἡ ἐμφάνισις τοῦ Ἰσλάμ ὡς χὴ ὅλη ἀπουσία ἐξαπλώσεως ἀπ' ἀνατολᾶς τοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ ἔργον ἐστὶ τῆς ἀδρανείας τῆς ἀνατολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἐπ' αἰῶνας ἀσχοληθείσης περὶ σκοτεινὰ δόγματα ὡς ἄνεν τοῦ Λόγου ἔδοξεν ἀσφόροις ἀνθρώποις, οὐχὶ τὴν διάδοσιν τοῦ φωτεινοτάτου εὐαγγελίου Χριστοῦ! Οἱ διωγμοὶ τῶν ἐν Βαλκανίοις αἵρετικῶν ἐξωθηθέντων τελικῶς εἰς τὸν Ἰσλαμισμόν τῆς "χριστιανικῆς εὐλαβείας" ἦσαν παράγωγα, ἕως τοῦ νῦν διαρκοῦντα! Διὰ πόσα βυζαντίν' ἀληθῶς νῦν σεμνύνεται ὁ ὅπου γῆς δίκαιος ἄνθρωπος, καὶ διὰ πόσ' ἀρχαῖα Ἑλληνικά τε καὶ "Δυτικά", ἅπερ ἀβυσσαλέως μισοῦσι πάντες οἱ μετὰ τοῦ κ. Χριστοδούλου κατὰ τῆς "Δύσεως" νῦν λυσσωδῶς βάλλοντες; Ἐὰρ θελήσει χριστιανικῶς, οὐ δικολαβικῶς, ἐξηγήσαι ἡμῖν τὰς αἰτίας; Ἡ ἀρ' ὅλως ἀπέλιπεν ἡ αἰδώς;

Ἐρωτᾶται: Ἐξεστὶν ἀρχιερεῖ Χριστιανῶ ἀθέοις συμπολεμεῖν Χριστιανούς; Πάντως ὀφείλει τοιοῦτους ἐξελεξάμενος **strange bedfellows** κάπο κείνων διδάσκεσθαι *τᾶριστα*, οὐχὶ μόνον τὰ κάκιστα! Καὶ γὰρ εἰσὶ τινες κομμουνιστὰι εὐλογοῦντες ὃν Θεὸν οὐ πιστεύουσι διὰ τὴν ἥτταν αὐτῶν ἐν Ἑλλάδι, ὅτι ῥᾶστόν ἐστὶ νῦν ἰδεῖν ποῦ νῦν ἂν ἦμεν εἰ τότε κείνοι ἐνίκων! Οὐκ ὀφείλομεν τοῦτο μετ' ἐγγνωμοσύνης ἀνθ' ὕβρεων εἰς τὴν "μυσητὴν ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων Δύσιν"; Διὰ τί οὖν ὁ ἐπ' ἀληθεία μόνῃ ὀφείλων ὁδηγεῖν τὸν λαὸν ἀρχιεπίσκοπος κατ' αὐτῆς οὕτω βάλλει ἐὰν οὐκ ἐνθυμῆται *τάκοίμητα* παλαιὰ πάθη, νῦν συμμαχοῦντα τοῖς τῶν κομμουνιστῶν, *ὡσαύτως ἐχθρῶν ἀκοιμήτων τῆς "Δύσεως"*, μόνων ἐν Βαλκανίοις πεισματικῶς πλὴν καταγελάστως ἀρνούμενων ὁμολογῆσαι τὴν ἥτταν, ἔτι παντοίως (ὡς διὰ κατασυκοφαντήσεως δι' ἐγκλήματ' ὠχρίωντα πρὸ τῶν παρ' αὐτῶν γενομένων ἀφ' ὧν αὐτοὶ οὐδέποτε ἀνένηψαν, δι' ὑποβολῆς ὑποψιῶν περὶ σχεδίων *μόνον ἐν τῇ ἐν πλήρει παρανοίᾳ διατελούσῃ φαντασίᾳ αὐτῶν ὑπαρχόντων*, δι' ὑποκινήσεως πολιτῶν εἰς ἀπεΐθειαν, ἀναρχίαν, φθοράς, ἀπιστίαν, στάσεις κατὰ τῆς πατρίδος καὶ τῶν συμμαχῶν, νέαν ἀποχώρησιν ἀπὸ συμμαχίας τῆς τελευταίας τοιαύτης ἐπιζημιωτάτης τῇ ἔθνει ἀπολύτως οὐδὲν αὐτοὺς διδασάσης, δι' ὑποθάψεως δεδηλωμένων ἐχθρῶν) ἀπεργαζομένων τῶν ὀλεθρον τοῦδε τόπου, καθ' οὗ τὸ μῖσος ἀκοίμητον τρέφουσιν; Ἀλλ' ἐνθυμηθῶμεν τὰ παλαιότερα: Οὐκ εἰς τὴν "Δύσεως" ἐν Ναυαρίνῳ παρέμβασιν εἰς τὰ "ἐσωτερικά" τοῦ Ὀθωμανικοῦ κράτους, *ἡμῶν ἐριζόντων*, ὀφείλομεν τὴν ὑπαρξιν τῆς Νέας Ἑλλάδος; Τοσαύτη οὖν ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγνωμοσύνη ἐνίων ἡμῶν; *Τίνες* ἐπὶ τέλους ἐσμὲν θρασέως παρὰ τῶν ἐνεργῶν ἡμῶν ἀπαιτοῦντες ὅπως ἀναλίσκονται ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν αὐτῶν πάντων, τῶν θανασίμως μισούντων αὐτούς; Ἐὰρ ἡμεῖς ποιοῦμεν ὡς ἀπαιτοῦμεν; Εἰ δ' οὕτω ποιοῦμεν, καλῶς ἄρα ποιοῦμεν; Ἐὰν ὁ κ. Χριστόδουλος χοῖ αὐτῷ συμμαχοῦντες ἐπιτύχωσι τὸ ποθοῦμενον, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀποχώρησις τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀπὸ τῆς "Δύσεως", ἐν ἣ δὲ στιγμῇ πάντες οἱ *μέχρι χθὲς ἐχθροὶ αὐτῆς τε χημῶν εἰσχωρήσ' ἐν αὐτῇ προσπαθοῦσι*, τίς ἄρα ζημιωθήσεται; Οἱ "Δυτικοί", ἢ *μόνος ὁ παρὼν τόπος*; Τίς δὲ χαίρησει; Πῶς οὐχ οἱ *ἐχθροὶ αὐτοῦ μόνοι*; Ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ κ. Χριστόδου-

λος μετ' αὐτῶν; Μόνον ἐὰν ὀφεληθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς τοιαύτης ἐκβάσεως! Μόνον ἂν οὕτως ἄρ' ἐκτιμᾷ ἔχειν τὰ πράγματα, καλῶς κατὰ τὸ συμφέρον αὐτοῦ, οὐ τοῦδε τόπου, βάλλει κατὰ τῆς "Δύσεως"! Ταῦτα ἵνα γνῶμεν ἐχθρόν τε καὶ φίλον, πνευματικόν τε καὶ ἀπνευμάτιστον, φιλαλήθη τε κάπο τῆς ἀληθείας κρυπτόμενον, χῖνα μὴ πλήρως παραφρονήσωμεν! Ὅτι τὸ συκοφαντεῖν προστάτην καὶ φίλον ἔμπροσθέν τε καὶ ὀπίσθιν τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ, δοκεῖν πνευματικὰ τάπνευμάτιστα, λησμονεῖν καὶ διαστρέφειν ἀλήθειαν, ἀτίμου τε καὶ παράφρονος ἴδια!

Ἄλλα πέραν αὐτοῦ, χῖνα συνέλθωμεν ἐπὶ τέλους καὶ περὶ τοῦ τίνας νῦν εἶναι ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ ποίας ὁδοῦ ἤλθομεν ᾧδε: Διατί πελιδνῶς οὐκ ἐρωτῶμεν πρῶτον μὲν *ποῦ* ὁ κόσμος πολιτισμὸς νῦν ἦν ἂν, εἰ ὁ *δηθεν* θαυμαστός βυζαντινὸς τρόπος ἐνίκη; Δεύτερον δὲ *ποῦ* ὁ κόσμος πολιτισμὸς νῦν ἦν ἂν, εἰ τὸ Βυζάντιον οὐκ ἐτίθει ἐπ' αὐτῷ *δεινοτάτην* τὴν τροχοπέδην ἐπ' αἰῶνας μακροῦς, σκοτεινοῦς, τῶν ἑνδεκα πλείονας; Τρίτον δὲ μὴν ἄρα *πεισματικῶς προσκεκολλημένοι* εἰς τὸν βυζαντινὸν-βαλκανικὸν τρόπον *ἐπιτείνουμεν* τὴν ἀναπόφευκτον σύγκρουσιν *ἥνπερ* διαβιούμεν τοῦ παρελθόντος ὅπερ *δικαίως* παρήλθεν, ὅπερ *παραλόγως* τε καὶ *ματαίως* προσπαθοῦμεν διαιωνί-σαι, μετὰ τοῦ παρόντος τε ὅπερ *διὰ τὸ στιγμιαῖον αὐτοῦ* δεῖ *ἀβεβαίως πανταχόθεν* παρέχει τὰς ἐπιδράσεις καὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος ὅπερ ἐπέρχεται ὥσπερ δεῖ ἔρχεσθαι, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν τῷ παρόντι, δι' *ἡμᾶς ὄντας ὡς νῦν ἐσμέν*, οἰκοδομεῖται ὡς χρή; Μὴν ἄρ' οὕτω *δίκαια* πάσχομεν διότι καὶ ἄλλας τῆς γῆς ἑαυτοὺς ὥσπερ Ὁρθοδόξους πιστεύουμεν καὶ *ἐμωράνθημεν σφόδρα* προσκολληόμενοι παρελθούσιν, ἀρνούμενοι τὸ μέλλον ἀλίσαι ὡς χρή; Ἀρνούμεθα ὅτι *κατ' ἐξέλιξιν ἀδερρίτως* ἤλθομεν ᾧδε; *Πῶς ἄλλως* ἤλθομεν ᾧδε; Ἀρνούμεθα ὅτι *ἐπ' αἰῶνας μακροῦς ἀνοικοδομήτως* διὰ τοῦ *Βυζαντίου* τὸ μέλλον παρήρχετο ἵνα *παγκοσμίως καταλήξῃ ὡς νῦν ἔχει*; Διατί οὖν *ἄλλους* μεμφόμεθα *κοὺ συνεχόμεθ'* ἀδράν νῦν τὴν ἡμετέραν καθορῶντες εἰκόνα εἰς αὐτόν γε τὸν τόπον ὅπου ποτὲ ὁ πολιτισμὸς ἐγεννήθη, ὅπου ὕστερον διὰ *μόνα* τὰ *ἡμέτερα* ἔτι *φευζῶντα* πάθη ἐτάφη; Πῶς οὐκ ἄρα προσήκει ἡμῖν Αἰδῶς, ΜΕΤΑΝΟΙΑ, ΜΕΤΑΜΕΛΕΙΑ καὶ ΣΙΓΗ, ἀντὶ τῆς *θρασύτατης* τῇ "Δύσει" ἡμῶν "ἀποκρίσεως"; Ἴδε τὸ ἀπ' Ἀνατολῆς "φῶς"!

Ἄλλ' ἔστι καὶ τοῦτο τὸ σπουδαιότατον: Ὡς τὰ *βαθύτατα* ἀνομολόγητα *θρησκευτικὰ* πάθη ῥιπίζουσι τὰς φοβεράς φλόγας, θελήσομεν ἄρα ἰδεῖν ὑπ' αὐτὰς ὅπερ ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ διὰ τὸ *φέγγος αὐτοῦ*, διὰ *μόνην* τὴν *ἡμετέραν τυφλότητα*, οὐ καθορῶμεν, τουτέστιν ὅτι *Θεῖα ἐπιταγή* ἐστὶν ἢ ἐν *μῇ πόλει* *συνένωσις* τοῦ κόσμου παντός; *Πῶς* πρὸ τῆς *Κρίσεως ἄλλως* ἔτοιμοι τῆς *μῆς Πόλεως Παραδείσου* *γενήσονται* οἱ πρὸ αὐτοῦ ἀναμένοντες; *Τί* ἄρ' ἐστὶν ἡ *χριστιανικὴ ἀδελφότης* εἰ οὐκ ἔστι κενή, εἰ οὐκ ἔστι *κάν* *μῇ πόλει* *διὰ τοῦ κόσμου παντός ἀδελφικὴ πολιτικὴ διαβίωσις*; Γιγνώσκουσιν οὖν τί ποιοῦσιν οἱ διὰ λόγους "θρησκευτικούς" *λυσσῶδως ἀνθιστάμενοι*, οἵτινες νῦν καταδείκνυντ' *ἀνάξιοι* τῶν προδιαγραφῶν τοῦ *Λογικοῦ Θείου Σχεδίου*; Νομίζουσιν οὗτοι ὅτι ὡς *χωριᾶται βαλκάνιοι* *πλήρεις* *παθῶν* εἰσελεύσονται, ἢ προσδοκῶσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ *μόνου αὐτῶν* *μὴ συνεργούντων ἄλλ'* *ἀνθισταμένων* τὴν αὐτῶν *ἰδίαν ἀνάταξιν* (new ordering), *βλασφήμως* ἀπ' Αὐτοῦ ἀναμένοντες ἅπαν τὸ *οὕτω βίαιον* *κάρα* οὐ σὺν Αὐτῷ

πρὸς σωτηρίαν αὐτῶν ἔργον; Πῶς οὖν οὐκ ἄρα κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ αὐτοὶ ἐνεργοῦσιν *ὑπονομεύοντες, οὐκ ἔσωθεν συνεργοῦντες* ἀρεστήν Αὐτῷ τὴν Νέαν Τάξιν ποιῆσαι; Σφάλλω ἀνορθόδοξως; Θεολογικῶς ὑποδειξάτωσάν μου τὸ σφάλμα! Πῶς οὐκ ἐστὶ περιεργότατον ὅτι μάλιστα πόλλ' ἀπὸ τῶν "Ὁρθοδόξων" περὶ "Ὁρθοδοξίας" ἀκούομεν, οὐδὲν ὅμως περὶ Θεοῦ τε καὶ Κρίσεως; Προσβάλλει οὖν *ὡς καὶ αὐτοὺς* ἡ τοιαύτη παρουσίασις τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τῆς Κρίσεως; Ἄλλ' εἰ Θεὸς (καὶ Κρίσις) οὐκ ἐστίν, οὐδὲν ἀπηγόρευται, ἡ "Ὁρθοδοξία" *ἀναξία φευδῆ ἐστὶ γοητεύουσα ἀνοήτους*, ὁ πολιτισμὸς ὅλος *κενὸς ἐστὶ νοήματος, κοῦδεις δι' οὐδὲν* ἄρα δικαιоῦται διαμαρτύρεσθαι!

Οἱ δ' ἀθέως τὴν Νέαν Τάξιν μαχόμενοι τοῦτ' ἀναγνώρισαι ὀφείλουσιν, εἴ γε θέλουσι μετ' ἐντίμῳν συγκαταλέγεσθαι: "Ὅτι *ὡς κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν* τὰ παρ' ἡμῶν ἐλεγχόμενα πράγματ' ἐμφανίζετ' ἐν χρόνῳ, ὅλως ἀνόητον ἄρ' ἐστὶ τὸ θαυμάζειν καὶ μέμφεσθαι τὴν "βαρβαρότητα" τῶν ὅπλων ὧν νῦν χρῆται ἡ "Δύσις"! Τὰ κατὰ *πάσαν* ἐποχὴν ὅπλα μέρος ἐστὶ πασῶν τῶν κατ' αὐτὴν μηχανῶν καὶ τῆς *συνολικῆς* πολιτισμοῦ, πολιτειῶν καὶ πολιτῶν *πνευματικῆς* καταστάσεως! Βάρβαρα τὰ ὅπλα; *Ἰσως βάρβαρ' ἄρα καὶ αἱ αἰτίαι αὐτῶν!* Ἀεὶ οἱ λαοὶ *πάντες*, ἕκαστος ὡς ἐδύνατο, ἐπεδόθησαν εἰς αἰὲς τελειότερους ἐξοπλισμούς! Δι' ὧν αἱ σφαγαὶ αἰὲς ἐκρίθησαν βάρβαρ' ὑπὸ τῶν ὑποστάντων αὐτάς! Εἴπομεν ὅτι ὡς ἐν θαλάσῃ ἰχθυὺς φερόμεθα! Τοῦ μέχρι πρό τινος "ὑπαρκτοῦ" ἡττηθέντος στρατοπέδου οἱ θαυμασταὶ ἐν ταύτῳ ἡγωνίσθησαν δρόμῳ, οὐχὶ ὀλιγώτερον βάρβαρ' ἀνέπτυξαν ὅπλα, καὶ τὸ μάλιστα μείζον τῆς βαρβαρότητος ἦν νῦν μέμφονται κατέχουσι τρόπαιον! Ἀπὸ γὰρ κατέχομεν τὰς ἐνδείξεις ὅτι εἰ κείνοι ἐνίκων *μάλιστα χεῖρων* νῦν ὁ κόσμος ἦν ἂν! Ὡς καὶ τοῦ παρόντος πολέμου τὰ αἷτια *ἔργα* ἐστὶ μετῃμφισμένων ἀρχόντων τοῦ "τέως ὑπαρκτοῦ" στρατοπέδου· πρώτων αὐτῶν ἀπολύτως οὐδὲν διδαχθέντων ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων αὐτῶν *κενῶν* λόγων περὶ τῆς ἀνευ Θεοῦ *δῆθεν ἀδελφότητος* τῶν "λαῶν", οὐχὶ γε τῶν *ἀνθρώπων!* Μὴ λησμονώμεν: *Πάντες* οἱ "λαοὺς", "κοινωνίας", ἡ "ἐκκλησίας" ὑπὲρ τοὺς *καθ' αὐτοὺς ἀνθρώπους* τιθέντες αἰσχροὶ τε κἀπάνθρωποι εἰσὶ σοφισταί! Ὡς κἀν παντὶ ἐτέρῳ ἀγῶνι, ἀναπόφευκτον ἦν εἶς ἐν τέλει, ὁ ἄριστος, τὴν νίκην καταγαγεῖν κἀς τὸν ἀπὸ χρόνων ἀρχαίων περὶ παγκοσμίου κυριαρχίας ἀγῶνα! Τῶν οὖν ἡττημένων οἱ γόοι, θρήνοι καὶ *ψευδῆς* ὑποκριτικὴ "ἀγανάκτησις" οὐδένα δύνανται πείθειν! *Καὶ τοῦ κείνων ἐπαίνου*, μέχρι τῆς χθὲς ἀγωνισθέντων ἐπὶ ταῦτ' ἔπαθλον, ἄξιός ἐστιν ὁ νικητῆς! Καὶ μᾶλλον ἐστίν ἡττημένων πλὴν πάντως *γενναίων ἀνδρῶν* ἴδιον τὸ λέγειν αὐτῷ· Νενίκηκας, Κύριε, εὐγέ σοι! Καὶ μάλιστα μείζον' ἔπαινον ἔξεις, εἰ κατορθώσης πρὸς ἡν αἰὲς ἐπεκαλέσω Δικαιοσύνην ἀξίαν τῆς νίκης σου ἀγαγεῖν τὸν ἐφ' οὗ πλέον μόνος προΐστασαι κόσμον! Δεῖξον ἡμῖν τί χήμας δεῖ ποιεῖν ἐπὶ κείνο τὸ δίκαιον τέλος! Καταδείκνυσιν ὁ ἡττηθεὶς γενναιότητα *οὕτω ἐπ' ἔτι ἀνώτερα, πνευματικώτερα* τὸν νικητὴν προκαλῶν! Πᾶς ἄλλος λόγος, λόγος κακίας κακῶς ἀνατεθραμμένων μειράκων ἐστὶ! Πᾶς δὲ λόγος ἀπαρεσκείας τῷ ἐπελθόντι ἀποτελέσματι *ἀτιμάζει τὸν λέγοντα*: *Πάντες* γὰρ μετείχομεν τοῦ ἀγῶνος! Πῶς οὖν "σοβαρῶς" νῦν τινες λέγουσιν ὅτι οὐκ ἤδεσαν τὸ πρὸς ὁ μεθ' ὅλης ὁρμῆς ἔτρεχον τέλος;

Ὡς οὖν ὡς μείρακες φέρονται νῦν οἱ *ἀτιμάζοντες καὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ*

τὴν Ὁρθοδοξίαν ἐμμένοντες εἰς ἀμφοτέρω τά τε ἀπὸ τῆς μισητῆς Δύσεως ἀγαθὰ καὶ τὰ τυφλὰ βυζαντινὰ-βαλκανικὰ αὐτῶν πάθη, ἅπερ ἀσύστολοι καὶ μείζονα πολιτισμὸν ὀνομάζουσιν, ἀνάγκη μεγάλη πλεον ἔστιν ὅπως κατὰ ΤΙΜΗΝ ἀποπληρώσωσι τῇ Δύσει *πάσαν τὴν ὀφειλήν* (εἷς τε χρῆμα καὶ *πάν* εἶδος, ὡς φερ' εἰπεῖν τεχνικόν, ἱατρικόν, φαρμακευτικόν, πολιτισμικόν, ληφθὲν ἀπ' αὐτῆς) ἵνα μὴ καὶ *καταχραστὰς οἱ παντελῶς ἄφρονες* ἀποδείξωσιν ἑαυτοὺς, *ἐντίμως* ἐὰν θέλωσιν ἀναδραμεῖν τὴν ὁδὸν πρὸς τὸ λοιμόπληκτον βυζαντινὸν παρελθόν, ἀφ' οὗ *μόνη* ἡ μισητὴ αὐτοῖς "Δύσις" τὸν κόσμον ἀπήλλαξεν! Ἐλεύθερ' εἰσὶν εἴτα ποιῆσαι ὡς θέλουσι, νῦν *διανγέστατον* πρὸ αὐτῶν ἔχοντες τὸ τί μέλλει ἀκολουθῆσαι! "Ὅτι *μάλιστα φορτικοὶ* τῷ λοιπῷ κόσμῳ εἰσὶν ὡς νῦν ἐμφανίζονται, ἔτι ἐπισεύοντες τὰς αὐτῶν *μείζονας τοῦ Σταυροῦ ἐρυθρὰς ἡττηθείσας* σημαίας ἀπ' ἐντὸς *πασῶν* τῶν ἐν Ἑλλάδι κοινωνικῶν τάξεων ἃς δεινῶς διαβρῶσαι ἡλιθίως αὐτοῖς ἐπετράπη χάριν τῆς ἐθνικῆς κληθείσης ὁμοφυχίας (*ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀπωλείας τῆς μνήμης, τῆς καὶ διὰ παθημάτων, οὐ μίσους ὅπερ αὐτοὶ ἀκοίμητον τρέφουσι, τὸ μέλλον οἰκοδομοῦσης*) τῆς νῦν *ὁρατῶς* πλην τυφλῶς ἐπὶ τὰ ὀπίσω, οὐ πρόσω, ὁδηγούσης τὸ ἔθνος, ἀντιδραστικῶς πρὸς πάντα τὰ κατ' αὐτοὺς *μόνους* "παράφρονα" λοιπὰ ἔθνη! Καὶ γὰρ οὐδεὶς ἔξεστί πως πεδεῖν τὴν πορείαν τοῦ κόσμου ἐπὶ τὸ Τέλος, ὡς αὐτὸ ἀπὸ συστάσεως κόσμου ὠρίσθη! "Ὅτι *μάλιστα* ἀγενέστατοι ἐνώπιον τοῦ κόσμου παντὸς καταφαίνονται οἱ τῶν εὐγενῶν γόνοι, νῦν *παντὶ τρόπῳ ἀσχημονοῦντες* ἐν ᾧ πρώτῳ τόπῳ ἀνεγνωρίσθη ἡ ἰδέα τοῦ Κάλλους! "Ὅτι *μάλιστα καθυβρίζουσιν* Θεόν τε καὶ Ἄνθρωπον ἐν ᾧ πρώτῳ τόπῳ δι' εὐλαβείας ἀνεγνωρίσθη ἡ ἰδέα τῆς Ὑβρεως, πλην πρὸς *ἀποφυγὴν*!

Ὡς νῦν διὰ τὴν *θηρσκευτικῶς κακουργουμένην* μισαλλοδοξίαν καὶ ἄνοιαν ("Ὁρθόδοξον", κομμουνιστικὴν, ἐθνικὴν) τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ κατοικούντων ἡ μὲν Βαλκανικὴ φλέγεται ὁ δὲ κόσμος πᾶς ἀπειλεῖται (*οὐ μόνου ἔνεκεν* οἱ "Δυτικοὶ εἰσέβαλον" ἐν αὐτῇ), ἅρ' αὕτη νῦν ἔστιν ἡ ὥρα, ὑστάτη πρὸ τῆς αὐγῆς τῆς νέας χιλιετίας, διὰ παντὸς ἀπαλλάξαι αὐτὴν καὶ αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ μίσους τῶν παντοίων σπορέων καὶ κακουργητῶν! "Ὅτι αὐτοὶ πρῶτοι οὐκ εἰσὶ σὺν Θεῷ!

Οὐδόλως χαίρω ἱστορῶν τὰ ὡς ἄνω! Ἵνα σοφώτεροι γιγνόμενοι *σωθῶμεν ἀπὸ τῶν μάλα χειρόνων* ὑποβάλλω ταῦτα τῷ ἔθνει! Λογικευθῶμεν ἐπὶ τέλους πάντες οἱ Ἕλληνες! Τὰ πάθη ἐξήρκεσεν, ἀποθανέτω! Νῦν ὁ *Λόγος* ἐπέστη καιρὸς! Ἀπ' αὐτοῦ πάνθ' ἃ δεῖ διδαχθῶμεν!

Ὁρθοδόξως ἀναζητῶν τὴν Ἀλήθειαν,

Re: LETTER TO MR. ST. ZOUMPOULAKES

Κύριον Σταῦρον Ζουμπουλάκη, Ἐκδότην
Περιοδικὸν ΝΕΑ ΕΣΤΙΑ
Εὐριπίδου 84
Ἀθήνας, 10553

τῇ 19ῃ Φεβρουαρίου 2000.

Κύριε Ζουμπουλάκη:

Κατόπιν τῆς μεθ' ὑμῶν χθεσινῆς βραχείας διὰ τηλεφώνου συνομιλίας ὑποβάλλω τὸ συνημμένον ὑπὸ τίτλον "Ἐπὶ τῇ Δισχιλιετηρίδι Ἱστορίας τε καὶ Δοξασίων τινων Βραχεῖα Κριτικὴ Ἀποτίμησις" ἄρθρον, πρὸς δημοσίευσιν.

Εὐελπιστῶ ὅπως ἡ ἀρχαΐζουσα γλῶσσα αὐτοῦ μὴ καταστῇ εἰς ἐμπόδιον! Ὑπὸ τῆς Νέας Ἑστίας οὐκ ἀπευθύνεται τοῖς πολλοῖς! Πρὸ δὲ τὰ γνωστῶς μακροῦ μεθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνου ἱστάμενοι καὶ συνειδήσιν ἔχοντες τῆς τῶν ἱστορίας πραγμάτων ῥοῆς, ὥς τὸ συνημμένον εἰς ταῦτ' ἀκριβῶς σημαντικῶς ἀφορᾷ, χρεοῦμεθα, δοκῶ, τῆς προσθέτου εὐθύνης τοῦ καθιστάναι τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ τοῦ παρόντος καιροῦ μαρτυρίαν κατανοητὴν ὑπὸ τῶν μεταγενεστέρων· ὅπερ ἀσφαλίσθήσεται κάλλιον ἢ αὐτὸ εἰς γλῶσσαν *διαχρονικῶς κατανοητὴν* ἢ γεγραμμένον. Ἡ "νέα ἐλληνικὴ" μὴ οὖσα κατάλληλον ὄχημα πρὸς ἀκριβῆ, ἀσφαλῆ, συμπαγῇ μακροχρόνιον φύλαξιν καὶ μεταφορὰν λεπτῶν καὶ περιπλόκων φιλοσοφικῶν κάπιστημονικῶν ἐννοιῶν, καὶ μὴ *φιλοξενούσα* καινόν τι *μακρᾶς* προσοχῆς ἄξιον πρωτογενῶς ἐν αὐτῇ παραγόμενον, ἀσφαλῶς ἐγκαταλειφθήσεται ὑπὸ σοφωτέρων ὕστερον ἡμῶν ἐρχομένων [ὅτ' ἀποκαλυφθῇ τῆς ὑποκρυπτομένης ἀληθοῦς ἐπιθυμίας εὐτελοῦς χρήσεως τῶν ἡσόνων ὑπὸ τῶν κρατούντων, ἐκπνεύσει τὸ μένος καὶ ὁ ἰὸς τοῦ παρόντος λίαν ἐπιζημίῳ τῇ βαρύτατ' ἀσθενούσῃ ἐλληνικῇ κοινωνίᾳ λαϊκισμοῦ, ἥτοι τῆς *ψευδοῦς* πλὴν *φαινομένης* ἐπιθυμίας τοῦ εἶναι τοῖς αἰεὶ ἡσσοσιν ἀρεστοῦς τοὺς καλλίονας, ἐνῶ ἡ πρὸς τὸν λαόν, ὥς πᾶσα γνησίᾳ, ἀγάπη μᾶλλον ἐπιζητεῖ ἀναγαγεῖν ἀγαπώμενον ἀπὸ βάθους!] οὐκ ἔσεται, οἶμαι, ἐν χρήσει κατὰ τῆς ἀπώτερον μέλλον!

Ἀναμένων τὴν ὑμετέραν ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἀπόφασιν, διατελῶ

Μετὰ πάσης τιμῆς,

**Re: ΕΠΙ ΤΗ ΔΙΣΧΙΛΙΕΤΗΡΙΔΙ
ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑΣ ΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΔΟΞΑΣΙΩΝ ΤΙΝΩΝ
ΒΡΑΧΕΙΑ ΚΡΙΤΙΚΗ ΑΠΟΤΙΜΗΣΙΣ**

(Ὑπεβλήθη συνημμένως τῇ προηγουμένῃ)

Ἐπὶ τῶν δημοσίων ἐπὶ τῇ δισχιλιετηρίδι σχολίων καὶ ἄρθρων—σκοπίμως ἀνέμεινα ἕως τοῦ νῦν, ἵνα γράψω τὴν παροῦσαν ὑπὸ τὸ πνεῦμα τῶν συνολικῶν προσφάτων ἑορτασμῶν καὶ μεθεορτίων.

Γράμμα πρὸς ἐφημερίδα οὐκ ἐστὶ τᾶριστον μέσον λεπτομεροῦς ἀναλύσεως τῶν σχετικῶν δημοσιευμάτων. Τὸ παρὸν οὖν ἐστὶν ἀναγκαῖον, ὥς τὸ μόνον μέσον στοιχειώδους ἀνασκευῆς τῶν ἐν ἐκείνοις πραγμάτων καὶ διορθώσεως τῶν δι' αὐτῶν ἐντυπώσεων. Πέραν ἑορτασμῶν κἀναμασθήσεως τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνων μακρῶν τετριμμένων, ὥς οὐδέποτε πρότερον ἔγνω τὰνθρώπινον γένος ὅσα γιγνώσκομεν νῦν, ἡ παρούσα δισχιλιετηρὶς προσφέρει τὴν *πρώτην ποτ' εὐκαιρίαν* προσπαθείας *κριτικῆς* ἀποτιμήσεως τῆς *ὅλης* μέχρι τοῦδε *πορείας καὶ σημασίας* τὰνθρώπινου πολιτισμοῦ καὶ τῆς δι' αὐτοῦ συσσωρευθείσης *ἀσφαλούς* γνώσεως. Ὡς δὲ τὸ προνόμιον τοῦ πολιτισμοῦ *οὐκ ἐστὶ μόνον ὠφέλημ' ἀλλὰ καὶ χρέος*, ἅρ' ἡ ἀνάληψις τῆς προσπαθείας αὐτῆς, *οὔσης πνευματικοῦ χρέους τῶν νῦν ζώντων*, καταπίπτει ἐπ' αὐτοὺς πρώτους τοὺς νῦν δοκοῦντας αὐτοὺς κληρονόμους τῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ πνεύματος θεμελιωσάντων καὶ πρώτων ὀδηγησάντων τὸν πολιτισμόν! Δικαίως οἱ *πρῶθ' ὡς* ἐαυτῶν ἀναγνωρίζοντες τὸ χρέος αὐτὸ ἀναγνωρισθῆσιν ὡς οἱ πάντων γνησιώτατοι κληρονόμοι! Διὰ τοὺς νῦν ζῶντας Ἕλληνας, ἂν μὴ κενῶς δοκῶσιν αὐτοὺς ἔχειν διαρκές καὶ ἰσοτέλειον τὸ (*μὴ κληρονομικὸν ἀλλ' ἀπονεμητὸν*) προνόμιον τοῦ πολιτισμοῦ, ὥς καὶ τὸ τῆς τιμῆς καὶ εὐφύας, ἡ πρόκλησις τῆς ὑπ' αὐτῶν *πρώτων* ἀναλήψεως τῆς προσπαθείας αὐτῆς, ἡ τῆς διὰ τῆς ἀπορρίψεως αὐτῆς ἀτιμώσεως, ἐστὶ προφανές! Μάρτυρες οἱ αἰῶνες!

Ἐν τῇ προσπαθείᾳ αὐτῇ, τοῦτο μὲν πρῶτον δεῖ ἐπὶ τέλους ἀναγνωρισθῆναι διὰ παντός παρ' ἡμῶν πρώτων· ὅτι Ὁρθοδοξία *οὐκ ἐστὶν* ἢ ἄνευ τῆς ἐκάστοτ' *αὐστηροτάτης* δυνατῆς *Λογικῆς* κριτικῆς παραδοχῇ παλαιοτάτων δοξασίων, υἱοθετηθεισῶν μὲν ποτε κατ' ἀγαθὴν πίστιν ὅμως δὲ μὴ παραμεινῶσιν συμφώνων τῇ *μετέπειθ' ἐκάστοτ' ἀρίστη δυνατῇ* γνώσει τῶν αἰωνίων πραγμάτων! Διότι ἐπ' ἄριστα, ὅ,τι ἐκάστη γενεὰ *ὀρθῶς* ὡς ὀρθὸν ἐκλαμβάνει οὐκ ἐστὶν ἄμοιρον τῆς *ὑπ' αὐτῆς κεκτημένης κατανοήσεως* τῶν πραγμάτων. Ὅτε γὰρ ἀνεξετάστως, δηλαδὴ *ἐσφαλμένως*, δεχόμεθ' ὡς ὀρθάς, ἀληθεῖς κἀν αὐταῖς πλήρεις παλαιὰς δοξασίας, ἀπλῶς μὲν παγιούμεν τὰς παλαιὰς περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων δηλώσεις κἀμμένομεν κατὰ "πίστιν" ἐπὶ τὴν

"παράδοσιν", ὅμως δ' ἀπόλλυμεν σὺν τῷ χρόνῳ τὴν *κατανόησιν* καὶ τῶν παραδεδομένων δηλώσεων καὶ τῆς ποτ' *αἰτίας* αὐτῶν κἀδυνατοῦμεν κατὰ Λόγον ἐξηγήσαι διατί δεῖ καὶ ταύτας εἰσέτι δοκεῖσθαι ὀρθὰς καὶ τὴν ζωὴν διαρκεῖν τοῦ γένους ἀνθρώπων μηδὲν σημαντικὸν ἕτερον ἀναμενόντων μαθεῖν· ὅπερ καὶ κενὴν ὄλην νοήματος καθίστησι ταύτην καὶ προάγει αὐτοὺς φιλοσοφικῶς καὶ ἠθικῶς ἐπὶ τὸ μηδέν! Ὡς ἀναμφιβόλως τοιαύτη ἐστὶ νῦν ἡ πορεία ἡμῶν, δῆλη γίγνεται χὴ σχέσις αὐτῆς πρὸς τὴν *ἀνεξέταστον* παραδοχὴν τῶν ἀρχαίων δοξασιῶν χὴ παράνοια τοῦ *οὕτω δι' αὐτῆς* ὀδηγεῖσθ' ἐπὶ τὸ μηδὲν ἀνθρώπους εἰσέτι δοκοῦντας κρατεῖν πλήρη τὴν ἀληθὴ *"πίστιν"* τε καὶ *"παράδοσιν"*· ὅπερ ἀκριβῶς περιγράφει τὴν παρούσαν κατάστασιν τῆς κοινωνίας ἡμῶν! Ἀνάγκη οὖν διατάσσει τοῦθ' ὡς ἀναμφισβητήτως ὀρθὸν δέχεσθαι· ὅτι Ὁρθοδοξία ἐστὶν ἡ *συνεχὴς κἀδιάκοπος Λογικὴ ἀναζήτησις τῆς οὕτω πλήρως ἐγνωσμένης Αἰωνίου Λογικῆς Ἀληθείας, μόνης* δικαιουμένης τῆς τιμῆς τοῦ ὀρθῶς *παρ' ἀνθρώπων ἀναθρούντων ἃ ὁπῶσιν κατὰ "δόξαν" καὶ πρᾶξιν* δοξάζεσθαι! Λέγεται γὰρ σήμερον· *"αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀλήθεια"*, *"αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μόνη ἀλήθεια"*, *"αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀληθινὴ ἀλήθεια"*! *"Αὐτή"*, ὡς ἂν ἦν ὀριστική! *"Ἀληθινή"*, ὡς καὶ ψευδὴς ἂν ὑπῆρχεν! Εὐρισκόμεθα φεῦ ἐν πλήρει συγχύσει, ἀγνοοῦμεν τὴν φύσιν τῆς ἀληθείας, δεχόμεθ' ἄντ' αὐτῆς ψεύδη! Ψευδολογοῦμεν μετὰ περισσῆς ἀκρασίας· *κάνεπι γνώσῳς καὶ κατεπι γνώσῳς!*

Τοῦτο δὲ δεύτερον δεῖ οὖν ἐπὶ τέλους συμφωνηθῆναι διὰ παντός· ὅτι *Ἀλήθεια ἐστὶν ἡ ἀκριβὴς περιγραφή τῆς καὶ μόνης ἀψευδοῦς, ἀντικειμενικῆς, εἰ καὶ ἄκρως ἐνοχλητικῆς Πραγματικότητος! Οὐχὶ ἡ καθ' ὑποκειμενικὴν ἢ πονηρὰν ἐκάστου ἡμῶν κρίσιν "ἀντίληψιν" καὶ "περιγραφὴν" τῆς λεγομένης "πραγματικότητος"!* Πραγματικότης δ' ἐστὶ τ' Αἶδιον Ὄν, αὐτός γ' ὁ Θεός (*ὡς ὄντως, εἰ ὄντως, οὐχὶ κατ' ἄλογον πίστιν*, Οὗτος ἐστὶ), καὶ *πάν ὃ, τι παρ' Αὐτοῦ ἀλλὰ χήμων ἐποιήθη* κἀν παρ' ἡμῶν οὐχ ὁμολογῆται ὡς ποιηθέν! Διότι οὐχ οὕτω κατὰ Λόγον φιλοσοφοῦμεν πάντα τὰ πράγματα, ταυτίζομεν οἱ Ἕλληνες τὴν *"Ὁρθοδοξίαν"* ἡμῶν τῇ *δῆθεν ὀρθῇ ἡμῶν "πίστει"* εἰς τὸν Θεὸν καὶ τῇ *δῆθεν αἰεὶ ὀρθῇ* ἐθνικῇ ἡμῶν πρακτικῇ, ἀλλ' *οὐδέποτε* ἐν ὅφει ἐορτῆς τιнос ἐκαθαρίσαμεν οἱ βλάσφημοι τὰ πνίγοντα τὸν τόπον ἡμῶν ἀπορρίμματα! *"Ἠγιάσαμεν"* αὖθις ὕδατά τε καὶ χώραν, ἀλλ' *οὐδεὶς* τῶν *"σπουδαίων καὶ ἐπισήμων"* (*τῶν ἱεραρχῶν περιλαμβανομένων*) ἠσθάνθη τὴν *καταισχύνην τῆς ἐπισήμου* κατὰ Θεοῦ βλασφημίας τοῦ *"συναγισμοῦ"* τῶν πανταχοῦ χύδην ἀπορριμμάτων καὶ περιττωμάτων! Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ μόνον, ὅπερ ἐναργῶς καταδείκνυσιν ὅτι οὐ πολιτευόμεθα κατὰ τᾶν, Ὁρθόδοξοι *οὐκ* ἐσμέν! Κατὰ τὴν ἔτους στροφὴν, *περὶ αὐτόν γε τὸν Παρθενῶνα, τοῦ κόσμου παντὸς καθορώντος καὶ τοῦ παρ' ἡμῖν ὑπουργείου "πολιτισμοῦ" χορηγούντος, ἐπιβλέποντος καὶ ἐγκρίνοντος*, ἐστήσαμεν τὸν *αἰσχιστόν ποτε* παραχθέντα *"καραγκιδοῦ μπερντέ"* εἰς *θρασύτατην βλασφημίαν Θεοῦ καὶ αἰώνων*, ἀναισχύντως περιφρονήσαντες ὅτι ὁ Παρθενῶν ἐστὶν ὁ *δι' ἡμῶν ἐρειπωθεὶς* κατὰ κόσμον Οἶκος τῆς *Παρθένου Ἀθηνᾶς*, ἡγουν τῆς *αἰεὶ οὕσης τελείας* Θεονόης, ἡγουν τῆς Θεοῦ Νοήσεως, ἅρ' οὖν καὶ τῆς ἀφ' Ὑψους *κατανόσεως πάντων* τῶν ὑφ' ἡμῶν πραττομένων! Τὸν Παρθενῶνα πρῶτος φλοξὶ παρέδωκε Ξέρξης. Εἶτα Τοῦρκοι καὶ Ἑνετοί. Ἐν καιρῷ πάν-

τες πολέμου. Νῦν δ' ἡμεῖς γε αὐτοί! Θρασύτατα, βαρβαρώτατ' ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἀσχημονοῦντες, διονυσιαζόμενοι· οὐδενὸς τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν διασήμεν κατανυγέντος! Καὶ "τραγουδήσαμε τραγουδάκια", ἤγουν διεξετραγωδήσαμεν ἐνώπιον τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τῶν αἰώνων τὴν ἀπόλυτον πνευματικὴν ἡμετέραν κενότητα, οὐκ ἐκαλέσαμεν τὸν ἐπίσημον ἡμῶν ποιητὴν (poet laureate, ὃν θεσμὸν εἰς τόνδε τόπον οὐκ ἔχομεν μυσταγωγοὶ ἡμεῖς γε αὐτοὶ τοῦ πολιτισμοῦ!) ἵν' ἐξ ὀνόματος τοῦ κόσμου παντὸς ἀναπέμψῃ ἐπὶ τῇ δισχιλιετία δοξολογίαν καὶ προσευχὴν εἰς τὸν Ὑψιστον! Τοῦτ' οὐκ ἔστιν Ὁρθοδοξία! Ἀνάξιοι τῆς κληρονομίας γεγόναμεν!

Διὰ τοῦτο περιδινεῖται τις ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ, ἀμφιβολίᾳ, ἀπελπισίᾳ! Ἐνῷ ἄλλος καλεῖ τὸ ὅλον εἶναι, τὴν Πραγματικότητα πᾶσαν "ένα τίποτε"! Κἄλλος λέγει πολλά, ἠθελημένως παρορῶν καὶ τὰς ἀπ' ἀρχαίων χρόνων ἱστορικὰς κοινωνικῶς διὰ τῶν γεινῶν ὑπὸ λαοῦ χήμιμαθῶν διδασκάλων-δημαγωγῶν ἐπὶ κακῷ "καλλιεργουμένης" (ἄρα, *κακουργουμένης*) τοῦ Ἑλλήνων ἐπικτήτου χαρακτήρος ἀδυναμίας, μήτε *καλυπτομένης* ὑπὸ τῆς αἴγλης τῶν ἐπιτευγμάτων ὥστε γίγνεσθαι ἀοράτους, μήτε Λογικῶς ἀναποσπάστους τε κἀναγκαίως πρὸς τὸ ἔχειν τὰς ἀρετὰς ὡς νῦν παρ' ἀπαιδευτῶν κήθελιμῶς ἀμετανοήτων δοκεῖται, καὶ τὴν ὁρατὴν πᾶσι τοῖς καθορώσι πολιτισμικὴν ἀσυνέχειαν τῆς ἑλληνικότητος τῶν διὰ τῶν αἰώνων Ἑλλήνων τὴν ἐν-συνειδήτως συντελεσθεῖσαν ἐν Βυζαντίῳ, ὄντως διατελέσαντι τὴν *σχάσιν* οὐ μόνως τῆς *συνεχείας* ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς οὐσίας, κάπνευγκόντ' *ἰσόχρονοι* καθυστέρησιν, τοῦ ἀπ' αἰώνων πολιτισμοῦ! Ἐν ἡ πολλαπλῇ παροράσει ἐμμένοντες παραλογιζόμεθα, τί λέγω, *παραφρονοῦμεν* δεινῶς! Ὁ δοκῶν ταῦτα ὑπερβολὴν λογισάσθω πρῶτον μὲν τοῦτο· πῶς νῦν ὡς πάντες ἐμμένουσιν ἐπὶ μόναις ταῖς λέξεσι, κεναῖς διειργασμέναις νοήματος, γεγυμνωμέναις ἀπὸ παντὸς σαφῶς συμφραζομένου διανοήματος, περιβεβλημέναις σκόπιμον παχεῖαν ἀχλύν, ὥστ' οὐδεμίαν ἐπὶ τοὺς λέγοντας ἐπιβάλλειν δοκιμασίαν περὶ τὴν ἑαυτῶν λόγων συνέπειαν! [Π.χ., τίς ἡ ἀκριβὴς ἔννοια τῆς ἐν πολλαῖς καὶ ποικίλαις παραλλαγαῖς ἐμφανιζομένης πλὴν παρὰ πάντων διαφιλονεκούμενης "ἑλληνικότητος". Ἐν ἀχλύϊ, οὐ διαυγείᾳ, λέγουσι γάρ τινες ταύτην ἔχειν παγκόσμιον πνευματικὸν ἐνδιαφέρον—ὡς κάκεῖνη κάκεῖν' ἀκαθορίστως παρ' αὐτῶν καθορᾶται! Ἄλλοι δὲ δοκοῦσιν αὐτὴν παντὸς ἐξ "Ἑλλήνων" αὐτονόητον κἀναφαίρετον "κεκτημένον" τε καὶ "δικαίωμα" δῆθεν *αὐτομάτως* κτηθέν διὰ τῆς κληρονομίας τοῦ αἵματος (ἢ τοῦ DNA ὡς τινες νῦν δῆθεν "ἐκσυγκεχροτισμένοι" πλὴν ὅλως ἀπαίδευτοι λέγουσιν, ἰδιότητα τῆς ὕλης τὸ Πνεῦμα δοκοῦντες), κατακεκτημένον ἐν τοῖς συγχρόνοις "κοινωνικοῖς" καλουμένοις "ἀγῶσιν"! Ὡς οὐδεὶς λέγει αὐτὴν *κτημα* τε καὶ *ἀπόκτημα* *δικαίως-ἐπαξίως* κληρονομηθέν μόνον καθότι καὶ διὰ πολλοῦ προσωπικοῦ πνευματικοῦ κόπου ἀποκτηθέν, ἄρ' οὖν οὐχ ὑπὸ παντός ἑλληνικὸν διαβατήριον ἔχοντος κἂν πλήρως ἀπέχοντος ἀπὸ τοῦ μεγάλου, καθαροῦ, συνεποῦς ἐν νῷ τε καὶ πράξει τε καὶ τῷ βίῳ παντὶ Πνεύματος τῶν Ἑλλήνων, δι' ὃ μόνον παρὰ πάντων δικαίως τιμῶνται μόν' οἱ τούτου συνεχῶς διὰ τῶν αἰώνων μετέχοντες, σαφέστατα δ' οὐχὶ οἱ παντὶ τρόπῳ δι' ἔργου, λόγου ἢ σιωπηρῶς αὐτὸ καθυβρίζοντες!] Εἶτα δὲ τοῦτο· ὁποῖους τὸ ἑλληνικὸν Βυζάντιον, οὐπερ ὡσαύτως ἐσμὲν κληρονόμοι, δι' ἀγάπης τῆς τελειότητος κό-

πῶ ἐπὶ τοῦ οἰκοδομήματος τοῦ παγκοσμίου πολιτισμοῦ ἐναπέθηκε λίθους;! [Ἄφ' Ὀμήρου ἕως ἰδρύσεως Κ/πόλεως ὡς ἔτη 1150. Ἄφ' ἰδρύσεως ἕως τῆς πτώσεως ταύτης ὡς ἔτη 1150. Ἐπὶ 1150 ἔτη ἀνεπέμποντο κεῖθεν τὰναρίθμητα "Κύριε ἐλέησον", ἐνῶ ὁ τῶν Ἑλλήνων πολιτισμὸς δι' "Ἑλλήνων" ἀσιγῶντων γεγονότων κατέρρεε! Τὰ "Κύριε ἐλέησον", τουτέστι τὴν διὰ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν ἐφ' ἡμῶν αὐτῶν διαρκῆ ἡμετέραν προσήλωσιν ἐπιθυμεῖ ὁ Θεός, ἡ ἔργα πολιτισμοῦ; Ἀληθῶς ἄρα νοεῖ ὁ Θεὸς καλῶς πληρούμενον ὑφ' ἡμῶν τὸ "ἀγαπήσεις Κύριον τὸν Θεὸν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου" ἐπειδὴν ἐκφέρεται πρὸς Αὐτὸν ὕμνος συρόμενος διὰ τῆς ῥίνος ὑπνηρὸς χύπνοφόρος, καὶ μακρὸς λίαν ὥστε καὶ τὸν χρόνον ἀντὶ ἔργων πληροῖ; Ἀληθῶς ἡ ὅλη καρδία, ψυχὴ, ἰσχύς καὶ διάνοια τὰναθροῦντος ἃ ὅπως ἐξαιτλεῖτ' ἐπὶ μόνῳ αὐτῷ; Τοιούτων "μελωδιῶν" εἶχεν ἂν ἄρ' ὁ Θεὸς χρεῖαν, ὥστε τὸν κόσμον δημιουργήσῃ ἵνα διὰ τῶν εὐσεβῶν ῥινῶν ἡμῶν ἀπολαύσῃ αὐτάς; Εἰ τὸ Βυζάντιον ἐπεκράτει ἐπ' Ἀνατολῆς τε καὶ Δύσεως, *συνειχίζοντο ἂν*, ναι ἢ οὐ, οἱ φοβεροὶ μεσαιωνικοὶ λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοί, οἱ κυρίως τότε ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ φοβερᾷ σημασίᾳ "θεομηνίαι" κληθέντες; Ἡ μήπως ὄντως ἄρ' ἦσαν θεομηνίαι διὰ τὴν ἐπὶ κείναις ταῖς μελωδίαις κατασπατάλησιν τοῦ χρόνου καὶ τῆς διανοίας τῶν ἃ ὁπώπασι μὴ ἀναθροῦντων, ὅθ' ὅλως ἄλλων ὄντως εἶχον οἱ ἄνθρωποι χρεῖαν; *Συνειχίζετο ἂν*, ναι ἢ οὐ, ἡ ἐποχὴ τοῦ ὄνου καὶ ἡμίονου, δηλαδὴ ἡ ἐποχὴ τῆς βασάνου ὡς καὶ τῶν ζώων διὰ τὴν ἀκατάσχετον ἀδολεσχίαν καὶ πνευματικὴν φυγοπονίαν τῶν "εὐσεβῶν"; Ἄρ' ἐπὶ τοιούτοις ὁ Θεὸς χαίρει; Ἄρ' ἵν' ἀνασκολοπίσῃ τὸν ἀνθρώπου πολιτισμὸν ἐνηθρώπησεν ὁ Θεός, ἡ μᾶλλον ἵν' ἀναγάγῃ καὶ αὐτὸν δι' οὗ μόνου καὶ τελειούμεθα ἐπ' ἔτι μείζονα τελειότητα, ζητήσας τελείους γίνεσθαι πάντας ἀνθρώπους; Πῶς ἀγνοεῖθ' ὅτι μεταξὺ τῶν ἐλαχίστων ἐνηθρώπησεν ὁ Θεὸς ὥστε καὶ τοὺς πρὸς Οὐρανὸν ἀναγάγῃ, οὐχὶ δ' ἵνα κατασχύνῃ τοὺς ἤδη σὺν τ' Ἀγνώστῳ Θεῷ ἀγωνιζομένους ἐπὶ τελειότητι; Εἰ τὸ Βυζάντιον οὐ διέτελει κείνην τὴνσχάσιν, ἦμεν ἂν νῦν, ναι ἢ οὐ, τοῦλάχιστον κατὰ μίαν πλείονα καὶ μάλα καλλίονα χιλιετίαν ἐπὶ τὰ πολιτισμοῦ πρόσω, καὶ δὴ ἄνευ τῆς πικρᾶς ἐμπειρίας πάντων τῶν ἀπὸ τῆςσχάσεως ἐξ αἰτίας τῆςσχάσεως ἐφ' ὅλης τῆς γῆς συσσωρευθέντων δεινῶν καὶ τῶν ἔτι ὀδηγούντων ἡμᾶς οὐπώποτ' ἀποτιμηθέντων λαθῶν καὶ σφαλμάτων; Διατί οὖν ἄρα τὸ 1453 οὐ δηλοῖ, ὡς γε καὶ ὠφείλε διὰ τοὺς πιστεύοντας εἰς Θεόν, τὴν ἀποστροφὴν τοῦ Θείου Βλέμματος ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκεῖ ποιηθέντων; Ἐπ' αἰῶνας τὸ Βυζάντιον κατετράχετο ὑπ' ἀφιλοσοφίᾳ θρησκευτικῆς διχονοίας, ἧς χάριν ἐγκατέλιπε τὰς ἀνατολικὰς ἐπαρχίας χόμοῦ μετ' αὐτῶν τὸν ἐπ' ἀνατολὰς εὐαγγελισμόν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, μηδενίσαν τὸ ἐκεῖ ἀρξάμενον τὸν κόσμον ἐνοποιεῖν ἐκπολιτιστικόν (ὄντως; ἡ μᾶλλον ἐφ' ἀρπαγῇ τοῦ Περσῶν πλούτου ἐκκινήσαν;) ἔργον τοῦ Μ. Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ τῶν Ῥωμαίων! Ἀντιλαμβανόμεθ' ἄρα καλῶς ὡς ἔργον τῆς ἐπ' αἰῶνας περὶ τὸ εὐαγγελίζεσθαι Χριστὸν ἀπραξίας τοῦ Βυζαντίου τὴν ἐμφάνισιν τοῦ Ἰσλάμ, ὑφ' οὗ αὐτὸ τελικῶς κατεστράφη!; Ἐτι ἀμετανόητοι περὶ τὰ ὄντως σπουδαῖα, ἀνατολικῶς ὀμφαλοσκοποῦντες καὶ νῦν, οἱ δῆθεν Ὀρθόδοξοι "ἀμύνονται" κατὰ τῆς "παγκοσμιοποιήσεως" καὶ θρασύτατα παρορῶντες τὰς βαρυτάτας ἱστορικὰς αὐτῶν

ἀμαρτίας ἀπαιτοῦσιν ὅπως ἄλλοι αἰτήσωσι παρ' αὐτῶν συγγνώμην διὰ τὰς ἐκείνων! Ὡς δὲ κείνοι ἤδη τὴν συγγνώμην τούτων ἐζήτησαν, οὗτοι μὴ συστέλλόμενοι πρὸ τῶν μᾶλλον μειζόνων ιδίων ἀμαρτιῶν φυσιοῦνται! Πιστεύουσιν εἰς Χριστόν, ἢ μᾶλλον παραμένουσι χωριᾶται βυζαντινοὶ καὶ βαλκάνιοι οἱ νομίζοντες τὴν ἔννοιαν τοῦ πλησίον περιοριζομένην εἰς τὰπολύτως στενὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς, οὐκ ἐξαπλουμένην ἐπὶ *πάσαν* τὴν γῆν; *Πῶς οὐ πάντες* οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἀδελφοί; Ἀλλ' εἰ ἀδελφοί, ἄρα χή παγκοσμιοποίησις ἐκ Θεοῦ! Ἡμῶν δ' ἡ εὐθύνη τῆς ποιότητος καὶ τοῦ ἔργου αὐτῆς! *Πῶς* ἀγνοοῦμεν ὅτι *καὺτὴ ἐστὶν ἀναγκαία* διὰ τὴν Κρίσιν; Λησμονοῦμεν ὅτι *οὐχ* ὑπάρχει ἐν Παραδείσῳ ὡς ἐπὶ γῆς σύνορα; *Παρορώμεν* τὴν *Ἀνάγκην* τῆς Κρίσεως! Ὁμῶς λέγομεν ὅτι ὀρθοδόξως πιστεύομεν εἰς Θεόν! Σύνορα ἐπὶ γῆς ἔχομεν οὐχ ὑπάρχει τοιαῦτα ἐν Παραδείσῳ; *Πῶς ἄνευ ἀσυνεχείας τοῦ Λόγου* γίγνεται ἡ μετάβασις, *ἐφ' ἣν ὡσαύτως καλούμεθα* Θεῷ συνεργάζεσθαι; *Τίς* τῶν "χριστιανῶν" "θεολόγων", "πολιτικῶν", ἢ "διανοητῶν" ποτ' ἀναζήτησε τοῦ νῦν ἐφ' ἡμῖν προβλήματος τούτου τὴν λύσιν; Ταῦτα παρ' ὁμοδόξου, ἵνα μὴ παρ' ἄλλοδόξου πρῶτον ἀκούοντες ταῦτα μάλιστα καταισχυθῶμεν οἱ ἑαυτοὺς Ὀρθοδόξους καλοῦντες!]

Ἄλλος δὲ *κεινῶς* ἀντιδιαστέλλει τὰ Θεολογικὰ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιστημονικῶν· κάξ αἰτίας τῆς πολλῆς κατὰ "παράδοσιν", ἢ "πίστιν", ἢ "ἀποκάλυψιν", ἢ "ἐπιστήμην" ἡμῶν "γνώσεως" ἀδυνατεῖ ἐλλόγως ἀποφασίσει τι περὶ τὸ ὑπάρχειν Θεόν, ἢ περὶ τὸ τί καὶ πρὸς τί ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τέλους τὸ σύμπαν, ἢ περὶ τὸ τίς καὶ πῶς ἐδημιούργησε τοῦτο! Λέγει τὸν Θεὸν τοῦ κόσμου δημιουργὸν "θεολόγος"; Ὅτι οὕτω *κόσμον, οὐ χάος*, ὁμολογεῖ, *Λογικὸν ἄρα Θεὸν δημοσίᾳ δι' αὐτοῦ δηλῶν, ἐπιφανέντα τὸν δημιουργὸν αὐτοῦ λέγει!* Οὐκ ἄρ' ὕστερον δικαιούται παρορᾶν, ὡς ὄντως κατὰ "παράδοσιν" οἱ "θεολόγοι" ποιοῦσι, τὴν *κόσμον* περὶ Θεοῦ μαρτυρίαν! Παντὸς σφαλλομένου ἀνθρώπου γὰρ ἀσφαλέστερον *ὁ ἄλαλος ἀλλὰ σοφώτατα τοῖς ἀκούουσι λέγων κόσμος Θεολογεῖ!* Μόνον ὅλως ἄσοφοι τοῦτο δύνανται παρορᾶν, καὶ περιφρονεῖν τὴν διὰ τῆς τοῦ *κόσμου* δομῆς περὶ Θεοῦ μαρτυρίαν! Πᾶς (*ἱστορικῶς ὑπὸ τῶν "θεολόγων" ἀρξάμενος*) χωρισμὸς τῆς Θεολογίας ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς ἐπιστήμης τοῦ *κόσμου* ἐσωτερικὴν τοῦ Λόγου παράγει διάστασιν· ἥτις ἄγει πρὸς διαρκίαν· ἥτις οὐ μόνον *συνειδητῶς* ὑποσκάπτει ὡς καὺτὴν τὴν ἐπὶ Θεῷ "πίστιν" αὐτοῦ τούτου τοῦ κατὰ "παράδοσιν" "θεολόγου", ἀλλὰ καὶ προάγει τὸ ἔρεισμα τῆς ἄνευ Θεοῦ, τῆς κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ "ἐπιστήμης" τοῦ "ἐπιστήμονος" ἀπὸ τοῦ "θεολόγου" *λαβόντος τὴν λευκὴν ἄδειαν*, παρέχουσα οὕτω τὸ διαρκὲς ἔρεισμα "θεολόγου" καὶ "ἐπιστήμονος", ὅπερ τινὲς δι' αἰσchrῶν ψιμυθίων ἐπιχειροῦσι καλύπτειν! Ἡμεῖς, διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἡμετέραν "σοφίαν" (ἀνάγνωθι, *ἄκραν* ἀσοφίαν κἀνοησίαν), σὺν ἄλλοις ἀνοήτοις ὧν ὁ ἀριθμὸς μέγας ἑαυτοὺς ἀριθμοῦντες, "μυστήριον" μέγα τὸν *ἀσφαλῶς διὰ τοῦ κόσμου ἐπιφανέντα* Θεὸν ὠνομάσαμεν, *παρεορακότες* τὴν *Λογικὴν* σημασίαν τῆς δημιουργίας, ἑαυτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ Ὀρθοδόξους οἱ ἄνθρωποι πάντες δοκοῦντες! *Παραβλέπομεν* ὅτι εἰ οὐχ ὑπῆρχε γυρόθεν ὁ *κόσμος*, οὔτε καὶ περὶ Θεοῦ εἶχομεν ἂν τὴν ἐλαχίστην ιδέαν! Ὅτι πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν *διὰ μόνου τοῦ κόσμου* ἀγόμεθα ἀσφαλῶς, ἔργου αὐτοῦ ὄντος Ἐκείνου! Παρορώμεν ὅτι εἰ ὁ *κόσμος* αὐθύπαρκτός ἐστιν, ὁ Θεὸς χῶς ἔννοια περιττεῦει! Ὅτι ἡ αὐθύπαρ-

ξία τοῦ κόσμου ἐστὶ ζήτημα οὐχὶ τῆς ἀεὶ ἀμφιβόλου εἴτε δοκουμένης φιλοσοφίας εἴτε θρησκευτικῆς πίστεως, ἀλλὰ τῆς ὑψίστης καθαρᾶς, αὐστηρᾶς, διαυγοῦς θετικῆς ἐπιστήμης! Περιφρονούμεν ὅτι ὁ κόσμος ὡς Λογικὸν ἔργον Θεοῦ ἀναγκαίως διὰ μόνης τοιαύτης τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, θεωρητικῆς καὶ πρακτικῆς ἐπιστήμης κατεσκευάσθη ἐκ τοῦ μὴ παντελῶς εἶναι εἰς τὸ ἐφιστάμενον εἶναι! Ὅτι εἰ ὁ κόσμος αὐτὸς ἀνευρίσκεται, ἀπ' ἐντὸς τοῦ κόσμου δεῖ καὶ τὸν φυσικὸν (τὸν τῆς Φύσεως ὄντα οὐχὶ τὸν τῆς "φυσικῆς" δοκούμενον) νόμον δι' οὗ αὐτὸς κυβερνᾶται εὑρεῖν τὴν καθ' ὅλα Λογικὴν ἰδίαν ἐξήγησιν! Οὐχ ὁμολογοῦμεν ὅτι αὐτὴ οὐκ ἀνευρίσκεται δι' αὐθαίρετων ποιηρῶς ἐπινοουμένων θεωριῶν δομουμένων ἐφ' ὑποθέσεων αὐθαίρετως συνομολογουμένων ἐπ' ἀπωτέρω ἀνομολογήτῳ σκοπῷ. ὧν ὑποθέσεων καὶ θεωριῶν ἡ Λογικὴ συνοχὴ οὐδέποτε λεπτομερῶς ἀναλέγεται ὥστε βεβαιοῦσθαι τὰδύνατον τοῦ ἐν αὐταῖς ὑπάρχειν οἷανδήποτε κεκρυμμένην ἀντινομίαν! Ὅτι ἀποτελεῖ βαρυτάτην καὶ καθηγητικῶς ἀπαγγελλομένην ὑβριν κατὰ τοῦ Λόγου τὸ ἰσχυρίζεσθαι, ὡς δῆθεν σοβαρῶν διανοητῶν Λογικὸν εὔρημα, τὸν κόσμον τυχαίως δι' ἀπροσδιοριστιῶν δομηθέντα· χῶς δῆθεν σοβαρῶν ἐρευνητῶν ἐργασίαν τὸ εἶτι ἀναζητεῖν, παρὰ τοῦτο, τοὺς νόμους τῆς τοῦ κόσμου δομῆς! Κατασκευάζει ἄρα νόμους ἀπροσδιορίστως ἢ τύχῃ; Ἀσφαλῶς οὐ! Λέγεις ὅτι κατασκευάζει; Διατί οὖν ἄρ' ἡ θετικὴ ἐπιστήμη οὐκ ἐντάσσει τὸν τρόπον τῆς τοιαύτης κατασκευῆς τῶν νόμων τῆς Φύσεως ὡς τὸ βασικώτατον αὐτῆς ἀντικείμενον; Διατί οὖν ἄρ' οὐ διαλύομεν τὰ κοινοβούλια, ὥστ' ἐλευθέρως, ἡγουν διὰ τῆς πολλαπλῶς ἀγαπητῆς ἡμῖν τύχης, ἀναζητῆσαι τοὺς νόμους δομῆς τῶν πολιτειῶν; Ὡς οἱ νομικοὶ (ὧν τινες οὐδόλως ὀρρωδοῦσι πρὸ τοῦ παραστήσαι μέλαν ὡς καὶ τὸ πάλλευκον) πάντως κατὰ τὸ πλεῖστον σέβονται τὴν ἐν τούτῳ τῷ λόγῳ ἐγκρυπτομένην Λογικὴν ἀντινομίαν, μάλ' ἄρα χρὴ τὸν ἀναθροῦνθ' ἃ ὅπως ἀνθρώπων καταπλήττεσθ' ἐπὶ θόρῳ ὡς καὶ μεγάλους καθηγητὰς τῶν θετικῶν ἐπιστημῶν, θαυμαστοὺς λίαν, θαυμαστῶς ἀδιαφόρους περὶ τῶν ἐν ταῖς θεωρίαις αὐτῶν ἐγκρυπτομένων ἀντινομιῶν, αἵτινες μόναι καταρρίπτουσι τὰς διὰ τῶν θεωριῶν συναγωγὰς, ἐν αἷς καὶ τὸς ὁ περὶ ἀπροσδιοριστιῶν λόγος!

Οὐδ' αὐτὴ ἡ θεωρία τῆς σχετικότητος ἐξαιρεῖται, εἰ καὶ ἐξελέγη ὁ Einstein ὡς ἡ κορυφαία διάνοια τοῦ αἰῶνος παρ' ἀνθρώπων εἴτ' ἀδυνατούντων κατανοῆσαι ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν τὴν ἀληθῆ σπουδαιότητ' αὐτῆς, εἴτ' οἰκοδομησάντων τὴν ἑαυτῶν διασημότητα ἐπ' αὐτῆς! Ὅτι ἐθεμελίωσε τὴν εἰδικὴν θεωρίαν ἐπὶ τῆς ὑποθέσεως (μόνον ὕστερον ἀναχθείσης εἰς ἀπόλυτον δῆθεν ἐπιστημονικὸν δόγμα, ἐπὶ τῷ σκοπῷ ἐδραιώσεως ὡς ἀληθείας τῆς θεωρίας!) τῆς σταθερότητος τῆς ταχύτητος τοῦ φωτός, ἀλλ' οὐδόλως ἐνδιεφέρθη μηδεῖναι τὴν πιθανότητα εἰσαγωγῆς διὰ τῆς ὑποθέσεως ταύτης δεινῆς Λογικῆς ἀντινομίας εἰς τὴν ἐπὶ ταύτης δομηθεῖσαν θεώρησιν τῶν πραγμάτων! Ὡς λόγος μήκους πρὸς χρόνον, πᾶσα ταχύτης παραμένει ἀληθῶς σταθερὰ μόνον ἐὰν αἱ μονάδες μετρήσεως ἀμφοτέρων ἐκείνων παραμένωσιν ἀπολύτως σταθεραί! Ἄλλ' εἰς διαστελλόμενον σύμπαν, Λογικῶς οὐδὲ τὰτομικὰ λεγόμενα ὠρολόγια (ἐξαρθῶμεν ἀπολύτως ἀπὸ τῶν ἐντὸς τῶν ἀτόμων μηκῶν, συχνοτήτων καὶ διεργασιῶν, καλυπτομένων ἐπὶ πλέον ὑπ' ἀπροσδιοριστίας, ὡς ἐπιμένουσιν) ἐπιτρέπεται θεωρεῖσθαι ἀπολύτως ἀμέτοχα μεταβο-

λῶν ἐπιβαλλομένων αὐτοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν ἔτι ἀγνώστων ἡμῖν παγκοσμίων νόμων! Ἡ δὴ λῶσις ὅτι οἱ γνωστοὶ φυσικοὶ (οἱ τῆς "φυσικῆς") νόμοι καταλύονται ὑπὸ συνθήκας ὡς αἱ τῆς γενέσεως τοῦ σύμπαντος ἐγκρύπτει τὴν σκόπιμον τῶν δηλούντων προτίμησιν τοῦ διδόναι τὴν μείζονα σημασίαν ταῖς αὐθαίρετοις αὐτῶν ὑποθέσεσι καὶ θεωρίαις, ἢ αὐτοῖς τούτοις τοῖς νόμοις τῆς "ἐκεῖ πέραν ἔξω" πραγματικότητος! ("Ἄλλως ὠμολόγουν ἂν οὗτοι τὴν σαθρότητα τῶν θεωριῶν ὑφ' ὧν μόνων ἀγόμενοι λέγουσι καταλυομένους τοὺς νόμους! Κάνεζήτουν ἂν οὗτοι νέαν ἐκ βάθρων θεώρησιν διασφαλίζουσαν τὴν διαρκὴ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἕως τέλους ἰσχὺν τῶν νόμων τῆς Φύσεως!") Ἡ σταθερότης τῆς ταχύτητος τοῦ φωτός οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀποδεδειγμένος νόμος τῆς Φύσεως! Ὁ οὐχὶ τυχαίως τοῖς πᾶσι γνωστὸς μόνος Φυσικὸς νόμος ὃν ἀναμφιβόλως γινώσκουμεν ἰσχύοντα καὶ πέραν τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς συνθηκῶν ἐστὶν ὁ τῆς Νευτωνείου βαρύτητος! Ὅτι ὁ Einstein ἄνευ ἐνδελεχοῦς ἀναλύσεως ἐθεώρησε τὸν νόμον αὐτὸν ἑλλειπῇ οὐδόλως συνίστησι καταισχύνῃ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ Νεύτωνος! Διότι ἡ πλήρης αὐστηρὰ τοῦ νόμου τούτου ἀνάλυσις ἐντελῶς ἄλλ' ἀκαταμαχίτως ἀποδεικνύει· οὐχὶ τὰ νῦν πιστευόμενα!: Ὑπὸ σταθερὰν παγκόσμιον μᾶζαν (περιλαμβάνουσιν καὶ τὴν τοῦ φωτός, οὖσαν πραγματικὴν κατὰ τὸν ὅρισμόν τῆς ἐνεργείας, οὐχὶ εἰκονικὴν-virtual ὡς κατὰ θεωρίαν) καὶ σταθερὰν τὴν καλουμένην "παγκόσμιον σταθερὰν τῆς βαρύτητος", συνθήκας ἐπιβεβαιουμένας "ἐκεῖ ἔξω", τὸ σύμπαν ἐστὶ πεπερασμένον ὑπὸ τὴν κλασσικὴν ἔννοιαν, διαστέλλεται ὡς κατὰ Hubble ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐφ' οὗ μονίμως μηδενίζονται πᾶς αἱ ῥοπαὶ κέντρου αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔχει τὰ σαφέστατα ὅρια τὰκτινωτῶς πρὸς τὰ ἔξω συνεχῶς διευρυνομένου μετώπου τοῦ πρώτου ἐκπεμφθέντος φωτός! Ὑπὸ τῆς παγκοσμίου βαρύτητος βαינוύσης ἐν χρόνῳ συνεχῶς μειουμένης ἐλεγχόμενη, ἡ ταχύτης τοῦ φωτός βαίνει ὡσαύτως συνεχῶς μειουμένη! Ὁ φυσικὸς χρόνος οὐκ ἐστὶν ἄλλος τῆς οὐκ ἀπείρου ἀλλὰ πεπερασμένης ἡλικίας τοῦ σύμπαντος! Κατὰ τὴν στιγμὴν τῆς "γενέσεως", ἡ ἔλξις τῆς βαρύτητος καὶ ἡ ταχύτης τοῦ φωτός ἦσαν ἀμφοτέραι ἄπειροι! Ἡ ἄπειρος ἀρχικὴ ταχύτης ἦν ἡ μόνη δυναμένη ὑπερνεκίῃσαι τὴν ἄπειρον ἀρχικὴν βαρύτητα! Ἡ ταχύτης φωτός ὀρίζεται πανταχοῦ ἢ αὐτὴ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ χρόνῳ διὰ τῆς πυκνότητος μάζης· ὀριζομένης ὑπὸ τοῦ χρόνου καὶ τῆς ἀποστάσεως ἐκ τοῦ κέντρου! Ταῦτα καὶ μάλα πολλὰ πλείον' ἢ οὐ τοῦ παρόντος, πάντα πέραν τῶν δυνατοτήτων τῆς θεωρίας τοῦ Einstein οὐδὲν αὐτῶν δυναμένης ὀρίσαι, πάντα κατὰ νόμους μαθηματικούς, ἀπλοῦς, συμπαγείς, διαρκείς, μὴ ἐμπεριέχοντας ἀντινομίαν τινά! Προσθέτους ἐπὶ, τουτέστιν ὅλως ἀνεξαρτήτους, τῆς τῶν ὑλικῶν σωμάτων μάζης καὶ φύσεως! Συνιστάντας τὴν συμπαγὴ νομικὴν διάστασιν τοῦ φυσικοῦ σύμπαντος, δι' ἧς μόνως τοῦτο εἰς κόσμον συνέρχεται, ἧς ἄνευ τὸ σύμπαν διέμενεν ἂν χαῶδες, ἄκοσμον, ἄμορφον, ἄνομον, ἄγνωστον! Ἀδιαμφισβήτητος ἡ ὕλη; Πολὺ μᾶλλον οὕτω χοῖ οὕτως ταύτην διέποντες διαρκείς νόμοι! Δι' ὧν ἐνεργούντων ἐκείνη γινώσκεται! Ἀλλὰ τὸ σύμπαν οὐκ ἐμπεριέχει φυσικὸν νομοθετικόν, κυβερνητικόν, ἐλεγκτικόν, ἢ ἀμφίδρομον ἐπικοινωνιακὸν ἀπείρου ταχύτητος μηχανισμόν, πάντας ἀπαρατήτους πρὸς τὴν τ' αὐτεξούσιον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τούτου ἀρχικὴν ἐγκαθίδρυσιν κάπολυτον ἐν παντὶ ἀκολουθήσαντι χρόνῳ ἐφαρμογὴν τῶν παγκοσμίων φυσικῶν νόμων! Τοιαύτης

ούσης τῆς φύσεως καὶ δομῆς αὐτοῦ, οὐκ ἄρα δεῖ θεωρεῖσθαι τὸ σύμπαν ὡς ἐνδογενῶς ἀποφασίσαν τοὺς ἰδίους αὐτοῦ νόμους! Τοῦτ' ἀδύνατον τῶν φυσικῶν ἐκείνων μηχανισμῶν-συστημάτων ἀπόντων! "Ἀρ' ἀναγκαίως οἱ νόμοι ἔχουσιν ἐξωγενῇ τὴν προέλευσιν!

Σαφεστάτη οὖν ἄρα καθίσταται νῦν ἡ ὅλη παρούσα συζήτησις: Καθότι νόμοι ὑπονοοῦσι τὸν νομοθέτην αὐτῶν! Ἐξωγενεῖς οἱ νόμοι τοῦ κόσμου; "Ἄ-ρα χὼ Νομοθέτης ἐκτὸς τοῦ φυσικοῦ κόσμου ἐμπεριέχοντος πάντα τὰ φυσικὰ ἐστὶ καὶ ὑπάρχει! Ἐπιβάλλονται τοῦ κόσμου οἱ νόμοι; Ὁ Νομοθέτης ἐπέβαλεν αὐτοὺς ἐπ' αὐτοῦ! Κατὰ τὴν ἐν τῇ συγκεκριμένῃ ἐν χρόνῳ παρελθόντι ὠρισμένῃ στιγμῇ δημιουργίαν αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ παντελῶς μὴ τι φυσικὸν πρότερον εἶναι εἰς τὰκολουθήσαν φυσικὸν εἶναι! Τὸν Δημιουργὸν καὶ Νομοθέτην τοῦ κόσμου Θεὸν ὀνομάζομεν! Ὑπάρχοντα καταδηλούμενον διὰ τῶν "ἐκεῖ πέραν ἔξω" νόμων! Παρεοραμένων, περιπεφρονημένων ἕως τοῦ νῦν, ἐγνωσμένως δ' ἀπὸ τοῦ 1985, ὑφ' "ἱεραρχῶν", "θεολόγων" "φιλοσόφων" καὶ "ἐπιστημόνων", οἷς ἐπισήμως ἔκτοτε τάνωτέρω εὐρήματ' ἀνεκοινώθη! Ὡς δέ γε δῆλον παντὶ σκεπτομένῳ ὅτι οὐδὲν ἐστὶ μείζον ἐρώτημα τοῦ περὶ ὑπάρξεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἢ τῶν ἑαυτοὺς κάπῃ τούτῳ διὰ Θεολογίας, Φιλοσοφίας καὶ Ἐπιστήμης ταξάντων ὡς τάφου σιωπῇ δῆλην τὴν σιωπηρὰν κάνομολογητοὺς ἐγκατάλειψιν ἄρα καθίστησι τούτων ὑπὸ τῶν τοιούτων, δηλούντων ἑαυτοὺς μισθωτοὺς ὁδηγοὺς ἐπὶ τὰ πνευματικὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων! Χῶς δέ γε δῆλον ὡσαύτως ὅτι ἔστιν ἀδύνατον ὀρθῶς ἀποτιμῆσαι ἱστορίαν (ἐν ἣ καὶ τάνωτέρω καταγγελλόμενα) καὶ δοξασίας (ἐν αἷς καὶ νῦν περὶ Θεοῦ τε καὶ κόσμου ἐσφαλμένως κρατοῦσαι) ἄνευ ἀναφορᾶς εἰς τὸν Λογικὸν Ἀίδιον ὄντα Θεόν, τὸν Λογικῶς πρῶτον παραγαγόντα τὴν παρούσαν πραγματικότητα ἣν κατανοῆσαι καλούμεθα, τὸ κατὰ πόσον μάλιστα σφάλλομεν κενῶς ἄνευ τῆς κεφαλαίας ἀναφορᾶς εἰς Ἐκείνον διεξάγοντες καὶ πᾶσαν ἄλλην οὐδὲν ἄνευ αὐτῆς οὐσιῶδες ἀναζητοῦσαν "συζήτησιν" περὶ τοῦ πρακτέου ἄρα δῆλον ὡσαύτως!

Ἄλλὰ καὶ τὸ πρόβλημα τὸνομαζόμενον "Θεὸς ἐνανθρωπήσας", τουτέστι Χριστὸς, ἐπίσης ἐσφαλμένως ἀντιμετωπίζεται, τριττὸν γάρ: Πρῶτον μὲν, ἔστι Θεός; Ὅτι εἰ ἐστίν, ἄρ' ἀμάχητος κατὰ Λόγον ἢ ἰκανότης Αὐτοῦ ἐλθεῖν εἰς τὸν κόσμον! Δεύτερον δέ, ἦν ὁ Χριστὸς κατὰ Θεὸν ἀναμάρτητος; Ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἀμαρτωλὸς ἐστὶ Θεός, καὶ μόνος ὁ Θεὸς ἀναμάρτητος! Τρίτον δέ, ἔστι Δικαιοσύνη; Ὅτι εἰ ἐστίν, ἄρα κατὰ Λόγον καὶ Κρίσιν ἀμάχητος! Ἐφ' ὅσον κατὰ τάνωτέρω ἀποδεδειγμένως πλέον ὑπάρχει Θεός, πῶς ἄρ' ἔτι δυνάμεθ' ἀρνείσθαι Αὐτῷ τὴν αὐτεξούσιον δύναμιν τοῦ παρουσιασθηναί ποθ' ὡς εἷς ἐξ ἡμῶν; Μὴν ἄρ' αὐτὸς ὁ Θεὸς οὐκ ἐστίν ὁ πρῶτος ἀνθρώπων ἃ ὅπωπεν "Ἀνθρωπος—δι' οὐπὲρ ὀνόματος πνευματικὰ μόνα δηλοῦντα γνωρίσματα; Τοῦτο διὰ τὸ πρῶτον ἐρώτημα. Διὰ δέ τὸ δεύτερον, ὡς ἀναντιρρήτως ἀμαρτωλὸς ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἐστὶ Θεός, ποίαν ἄρ' ἀμαρτίαν ἐνώπιον τοῦ Ζώντος Θεοῦ δύνανται οἱ εἴκοσιν οὗτοι αἰῶνες, πολὺ ἐρευνήσαντες, ἀναντιρρήτως προσάψαι Χριστῷ πέραν τῶν δῆθεν ἀμαρτιῶν ἃς ἐν τῷ νῷ αὐτῶν τινες ἐφευρίσκουσιν ὑποτιθέντες Αὐτὸν κοινὸν ὡς ἡμεῖς ἄνθρωποι; Διὰ δέ τὸ τρίτον, πῶς τοῦ Θεοῦ πλέον ἀποδεδειγμένως κατὰ τὰ ὡς ἄνω [ἄπερ γνωστά ἦν ἄν, εἰ ὁ τῆς βαρύτητος νόμος κατενοεῖτο δι' ὅλης τῆς σημασίας αὐ-

τοῦ οὐκ ἀπὸ μόνης τῆς τοῦ Νεύτωνος ἐποχῆς, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ μακρῶν προτέρων αἰώνων εἰ ἢ διὰ τοῦ Βυζαντίου συνέχεια τοῦ πολιτισμοῦ οὐ διεσπάτο!] ὑπάρχοντος ἔτι λέγομεν *ἀνθρωπίνην κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν ἐπινόησιν* τὴν Δικαιοσύνην; Τολμῶμεν *ἄνευ τινὸς ἀποδείξεως* λέγειν τὸν Ζῶντα Νομοθέτην Θεὸν ἄδικον; Διότι ἡ Χριστιανικὴ Ἐκκλησία *οὐδέποτε Λογικῶς κατενόησε* τὰ προβλήματα τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ κόσμου, τοῦ χρόνου, *ἔκθετον ἐγκατέλιπεν*, ἐπ' αἰῶνας συναπτοὺς εἴκοσι, τὸν Χριστὸν εἰς τὴν δεινὴν κατηγορίαν τοῦ μὴ γινώσκειν τί ἔλεγεν ὅτε εἶπεν ὅτι ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία καὶ νῦν αὕτῃ ἐπὶ θύραις! Κατεδικάσαμεν τὸν Ἀναμάρτητον, ἐγκατελίπομεν Αὐτὸν ἔκθετον, κοῦκ εἰσήλθομεν εἰς τὴν Κρίσιν; Ἔστι τις κρίσις ἐν ἧ οὐ κρίνεται αὐτὸς πρῶτος ὁ κρίνων; Πῶς οὖν ὁ φυσικὸς μετὰ Χριστὸν χρόνος οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ χρόνος τῆς Κρίσεως—*ἡμῶν* πλέον, τοῦ Κριτοῦ *τότε* κριθέντος; Τίς ἄρα δύναται εἶναι μείζων *ἐκείνης* τῆς μάχης μεταξὺ Καλοῦ καὶ κακοῦ, ἢν πάντες ἔτι *παραλόγως* φαντάζοντ' ἐπικειμένην; Ἔστιν ἄρ' ἡ ἐκ νεκρῶν τοῦ Κυρίου Ἀνάστασις ἐλάσσωσιν τῆς Δευτέρας Αὐτοῦ Παρουσίας, ἢ ἄρ' ἡ *αὕτῃ θριαμβευτικῇ μίᾳ*; Τῶν μνημάτων *τότε διὰ παντὸς κενωθέντων* ποῦ ἄρ' ἀναμένουνσι τὰ *πνεύματα* τῶν νεκρῶν; [Ποῦ ἄρ' ἦν ἂν αὐτοῖς δυνατὸν ἀναμένειν, εἴ που ἀνέμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου θανόντος;] Μόνον ἐξ ἀπαιδευσίας κάπιστίας ἐπὶ τὸν Λόγον καὶ τῆς συναπτῆς αὐταῖς ἀδυναμίας κατανοήσεως τῶν *παντελῶς διαφόρων* φυσικῶν καὶ πνευματικῶν πραγμάτων συγχέομεν ἀσυγγνώστως τὸν φυσικὸν καὶ *πνευματικὸν* χρόνον, μὴ ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι ὅτι ὁ μὲν φυσικὸς χρόνος θέει ἕως οὗ πάντες οἱ θνητοὶ ἐξαντλήσωμεν *πάσας* τὰς ἐπὶ Καλὸν ἢ κακὸν δυνατότητας τοῦ εἶδους ἡμῶν ἢ ἐπὶ πάντων τῶν ὑφ' ἡμῶν τελεσθησομένων κριθῶμεν, ὁ *πνευματικὸς* ἀπὸ τοῦ Σταυροῦ καὶ τῆς Ἀναστάσεως χρόνος ὅμως δὲ συνέχει ἡμᾶς *πάντας* (προαποθανόντας, θανόντας, νῦν ζῶντας, τεθνηκότας ἐσομένους, βιωσομένους τὸ φυσικὸν τέλος) καθηλωμένους πρὸ τοῦ φοβεροῦ Βήματος τοῦ Κριτοῦ, ἐν ᾧ *πνευματικῶ* τόπῳ ἐπὶ (τὴν ἤδη διαρρέυσασαν φυσικὴν) δισχιλιετίαν *κρινόμενοι* ἀσχημονοῦμεν! Τὰ περὶ τῆς *ὅλως ἀκαθόριστου ἀναμονῆς* τῆς *μελλοντικῆς* Κρίσεως ἐπὶ δισχιλιετίαν λεγόμενα, μὴ λεγόμενα, ὑπονοοῦμεν ὑπὸ τῆς Χριστιανικῆς Ἐκκλησίας οὐσίᾳ *συγχέει* τὰ ὀντολογικῶς *διίστάμενα* Πνεῦμα καὶ ὕλην καὶ *μειοὶ* τὰνθρώπινον πνεῦμα εἰς τι ἀκαθόριστον τῆς ὕλης ἐξάρτημα, προϊόν, ἢ ἀπαύγασμα· ὅπερ προάγει εὐθέως εἰς τὴν *ἄρνησιν* τῆς *ἀντικειμενικῆς* ὑπάρξεως τοῦ Πνεύματος ὡς Πρώτης Αἰδίου Οὐσίας! Δι' ὃ ἡ Χριστιανικὴ Ἐκκλησία ὑπέχει βαρυτάτας εὐθύνας διὰ τὴν παροῦσαν πανδημίαν τοῦ *ἐσκεμμένως τὸν Θεὸν ἀρνούμενου* διαχύτου ὑλιστικοῦ πνεύματος, δι' οὗ ἤδη τὸ κακὸν βασιλεύει!

Τοιαύτην δεῖ νῦν παραμένειν, *μέχρις ὡς εἰκὸς βελτιώσεως*, τὴν *Λογικὴν* ἀποτίμησιν τῆς ὅλης ἤδη συσσωρευθείσης ἱστορικῆς ἐμπειρίας καὶ γνώσεως. Τὰ λοιπὰ πάντ' ἀκατάσχετος φλυαρία ἐστί· τῶν τὸν ἄΛογον ἑαυτῶν λόγον, οὐχὶ τὸν Ἄναρχον Λόγον, φιλοῦντων! Οἱ εἴκοσιν οὗτοι αἰῶνες οὐπω ἐπέβαλον ἡμῖν σεβασμὸν τῆς *καθαρῶς πνευματικῆς* ιδιότητος τὰναθρεῖν τὰ ὀφθέντα· ὅς μόνος προάγει εἰς τὸν ὑγιῆ, *Λογικὸν* φόβον Θεοῦ! Ἄρα κατορθώσει αὐτὸ ὁ εἰκοστὸς πρῶτος διελέγχων *πάντα* τὰ προτέρω λεχθέντα, ὥστε παύσῃ πλέον ἢ ἐνώπιον τοῦ δικάζοντος Κριτοῦ βλασφημία;

Ἄλλ' ἵνα τοῦτο συμβῇ, ἀπαραίτητός ἐστι πρώτη ἡ διὰ τὴν μέχρι τοῦδ' ἀμέλειαν μεταμέλεια, εἴτα δ' ἡ ἀνάληψις τῆς ἐγγενοῦς τῶν ἀνθρώπων εὐθύνης κριτικῆς τῶν πραγμάτων ἀποτιμήσεως! Μηδεὶς ἄρα τῶν εὐθυναφόβων εἰσίτω! Μηδεὶς πειρῶν ἀποσεῖσαι τὰς διὰ τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ Λόγον ἀναποσεῖστους εὐθύνας λεγέτω ὅτι σύγχρονον τὴν διάνοιαν ἔχει! Μηδεὶς ἡσρόνως ἀποτιμῶν τὸ Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ τε κ' Ἀνθρώπου ἐπιμένετω καλεῖν ἑαυτὸν Ἀνθρωπον!

Ἡ τοῦ κυρίου Ζουμπουλάκη ἐπὶ τῆς αἰτήσεως δημοσιεύσεως τοῦ παρόντος ἀπόφασις εἶχεν ὡς ἀκολούθως:

" Ἀθήνα, 22. ΙΙ. 2000

Ἀξιότιμε κύριε Σταυρόπουλε,

ἄν διάβαζα τὸ κείμενό σας παίζων θὰ μοῦ ἄρεσε πολύ. Ἐπειδὴ ὅμως τὸ διάβασα σπουδάζων, σᾶς λέω ὅτι δὲν μπορῶ νὰ τὸ κρατήσω πρὸς δημοσίευσin στὴν Ν.Ε.

Μὲ ἐκτίμηση
Σταῦρος Ζουμπουλάκης "

AUTHOR'S COMMENT: Ὁ Ἀναγνώστης οὖν ἄρα, μικροσκοπικῶς κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν παρ' ἡμῶν προσβατὴν δύναμιν ἐξετάσας τὰ Ἱστορίας, Λόγου, Θεολογίας, Ἐπιστήμης καὶ τῶν συνεπειῶν αὐτῶν ἀνομολόγητα πράγματα, καλεῖτ' ἀποφαίνεσθ' ἐπὶ τοῦ τίς ἀληθῶς παίζ[ει] καὶ τίς ἀπλῶς "σπουδάζων" τὰ παρ' ἐμοῦ δηλωθέντα οὐδόλως ἐν παντὶ τῷ αὐτῶν βάθει κατανοήσας ἐξήτασεν ἀπεφώνησε οὐχί γε δι' ἀκλονήτων στοιχείων ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῇ βάσει τῆς διακεχυμένης τοῖς πολλοῖς γενικῆς δῆθεν "γνώσεως"!

**Re: ΦΙΛΙΑ ΔΙΚΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΥ ΠΑΡΕΜΒΑΣΙΣ
ΠΕΡΙ ΤΑΣ ΣΧΕΣΕΙΣ ΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ ΚΑΙ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣ**

Πρόεδρον τοῦ Ἀρείου Πάγου
Ἀθήνας 11522

19 Ἰουνίου 2000

Κύριε Πρόεδρε:

Ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐθις ἀνακινήντος γενικοῦ προβλήματος σχέσεων Κράτους καὶ Ἐκκλησίας, κυρίως περὶ τὰς νέας ταυτότητας, τὴν προστασίαν τῶν "προσωπικῶν δεδομένων", καὶ τὴν παρ' ἐνίων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν κύκλων ἀπαίτησιν κρατικῆς ἀπαγορεύσεως τῆς κυκλοφορίας βιβλίων κριθέντων ὑπὸ τῶν κύκλων αὐτῶν ὡς βλασφήμων, ἐπιτρέψατέ μοι ὑποβαλεῖν ὑμῖν τὰ κάτωθι, παρακαλοῦντι ὑμᾶς ὅπως:

(α) θῆτε αὐτὰ ὑπ' ὄψιν τῶν καθ' ἕκαστα δικαστῶν δικαζόντων κατὰ τὴν συνήθη διαδικασίαν, ὡς μάλιστ' ἀμφιβάλλοντι ὅτι ταῦτα τεθήσονται πρὸ αὐτῶν ὑφ' ἑκατέρου τῶν ἀντιδίκων μερῶν, ἐπὶ προφανεῖ κινδύνῳ ἑλλιπῶς ἡτιολογημένης ἐσομένης τῆς δικαστικῆς ἀποφάσεως, καὶ

(β) λάβητε ταῦτα ὑπ' ὄψιν κατὰ τὴν ἀναγκαιοτάτην καὶ οὕτως ἀναπόφευκτον πλέον καταστάσαν ὅλως ἀσυνήθη διαδικασίαν τῆς αὐτεπαγγέλτου ἐπὶ τοῦ ὅλου προβλήματος δημοσίας παρεμβάσεως τῆς Δικαστικῆς Ἐξουσίας εἰς τὰ δημοσίως διαδραματιζόμενα, πρὸ τῆς εἰς αὐτὴν καταφυγῆς τινος κατ' ἀντιδικίαν, ἵνα προληφθῶσι τὰ ὁρατῶς κατὰ τοῦ ἔθνους ἡμῶν ἐπερχόμενα χεῖριστα.

Γινώσκειτ' ἄριστα τὰ τῆς ἑλλιποῦς δομῆς καὶ τῆς κοινωνίας ἡμῶν, ἀντανακλαστικῶς οὐ προληπτικῶς, τουτέστιν οὐχὶ κατόπιν προηγουμένης ὠρίμου τῶν ἐπερχομένων ἐξετάσεως καὶ εὐφυοῦς ἐπὶ τοῦ πρακτέου ἀποφάσεως, ἐνεργούσης· καὶ τῆς Πολιτείας ἡμῶν, ὡς ἐκ τούτου αἰφνιδιαστικῶς καὶ σπασμωδικῶς κατὰ τὴν ἐκπνοὴν διοριῶν, ἄνευ γενικοῦ μακροπρόου σχεδίου συνυπολογίζοντος τὸ παρελθόν, παρὸν καὶ μέλλον τοῦδε τόπου καὶ τοῦ κόσμου παντός, ἄνωθεν καταπιεστικῶς ἐπιλαμβανομένης τῶν προβλημάτων· καὶ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἡμῶν, ἐπ' αἰῶνας μακροῦς πεισματικῶς ἀρνούμενης ἐνεργῶς συμπαρακολουθῆσαι τὰ διατρέχοντα ὥστε προσδιορίσαι τὸν ἄριστον τρόπον τῆς πνευματικῆς αὐτῆς παρουσίας καὶ μαρτυρίας ἐν τῷδε τόπῳ καὶ τῷ κόσμῳ παντὶ τὸν ἀπαντώντα εἰς/κατὰ τὴν ἐν ἐκάστῳ καιρῷ καταφαινομένην ἀνάγκην.

Ὡς ἐπίσης ὅτι καὶ διὰ τῶν τριῶν τούτων ἀνέτοιμοι ἠνεγκάμεθα ᾧδε·

ἐνίων ἡμῶν ὠθούντων ἐπὶ τὰ "πρόσω", ἐνίων ἐπὶ τὰ "ὀπίσω"· ὥς δὲ πάντων ἡμῶν (*ἄνευ τοῦ ἀναγκαιοτάτου ταπεινόφρονος συνυπολογισμοῦ τοῦ ποῖοι νῦν ὄντως* ἐσμέν, *ποῖαν* ἐπιθυμοῦμεν εἶναι τὴν παρουσίαν ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, *πῶς* ἐπὶ τοῦ κόσμου βάλλωμεν ἑαυτοὺς καὶ αὐτήν, καὶ *πῶς ἄριστα ἐπὶ τῷ κοινῷ τῶν ἀνθρώπων πάντων καλὸν συνεργαζώμεθα* μετὰ πάντων), διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἄγνοιαν καὶ ἡμῶν καὶ τῶν πέριξ, ὑποπτευομένων τοὺς ἐγγὺς καὶ μακρὰν περὶ ἡμᾶς ξένους, καὶ φοβουμένων μεγάλως τὸ αὖριον, ὃ οὐκ ἐργαζόμεθα φέρειν αἰσίως ἀλλ' ἀπλῶς παθητικῶς παρατηροῦμεν ἐπέρχεσθαι.

Ἀποτελεῖ τὴν *μεγίστην* τοῦ τόπου ἀδυναμίαν ὅτι ὁ δημόσιος *δῆθεν* "διάλογος" διεξάγεται *μεταξὺ κωφῶν ἀνεντίμως*, ἐκάστου τῶν (κομματικῶς δρώντων) μερῶν παρουσιάζοντος *στεντορείως*, ὥστε πνίγεσθ' ἐν τῷ θορύβῳ πᾶσα ἑτέρα φωνή, *μόνον* τὸ αὐτῷ ἀρεστὸν καὶ *οὐδέποτε πλήρες* μέρος τῆς ἀληθείας. *Οὐδεὶς* παρουσιάζει τὴν *σύνθετον καθολικὴν* τοῦ προβλήματος ὄψιν, εἰς ἣν ἐναργῶς διαφαίνονται καὶ αἱ ἐκάστου εὐθύναι καὶ τὰναγκαῖα παρ' ἐκάστου γενέσθαι. Ἴσως διότι οὐδεὶς πέραν τῶν δικαστῶν κέκτηται τὴν *ψύχραιμον ἱκανότητα κατὰ πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην κρίνειν* τὰ πράγματα! Διὰ τοῦτο εἶπον ὑμῖν ἀνωτέρω ὅτι νῦν ἀπαιτεῖται ἡ ὅλως ἀσυνήθης αὐτεπάγγελτος τῆς Δικαστικῆς Ἐξουσίας ἐπέμβασις!

Σημειώσατε ὅτι τὰ ὑπὸ τὰ προθέματα Α καὶ Β (*ἐλάχιστα διὰ τὰς* τῆς *ἀνάγκας* παρούσης προσαρμοσθέντα ἐπὶ τὸ κατανοητότερον) παρελήφθησαν (κατὰ τὰ λοιπὰ ὡς ἀκριβῶς ἐν αὐτῇ εἶχον—τοῦ δευτέρου πληθυντικοῦ προσώπου ὑπονοούντος ἐκεῖ τὸν παραλήπτην ἐκείνης) ἐξ ἐπιστολῆς μου τῆς 9ης Φεβρ. 1998 (*ἄρα, προηγηθείσης* τῶν ἔκτοτ' ἐπισυμβάντων) πρὸς τὸν κ. Γρηγ. Μιχαλόπουλον (τῆς ἐφημερίδος ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΗ ΩΡΑ καὶ τοῦ τηλεοπτικοῦ σταθμοῦ ΤΗΛΕΤΩΡΑ), ὅς οὐδέποτε ἐτίμησέ με δι' οἰασδήποτε ἀπαντήσεως. Εἰ οὗτος ἐχρήτο τῶν δι' ἐκείνης παρασχεθέντων στοιχείων, διάφορός τε καὶ ὠφελιμωτέρα τῷ ἔθνει ἀσφαλῶς ἦν ἂν ἡ ἔκτοτ' ἐπὶ τῶν συναφῶν ζητημάτων δημοσίᾳ συζήτησις!

Α. ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΓΕΝΙΚΗΣ ΑΠΟΓΡΑΦΗΣ-ΑΡΙΘΜΗΣΕΩΣ ΤΩΝ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΩΝ

ΠΡΟΟΙΜΙΑΚΑ

Ἐπιτρέψατέ μοι τὸ τῆς παρούσης περιεχόμενον. Προτιμῶ γὰρ διὰ τῆς γραφῆς κοινωνεῖν περὶ τὰ σπουδαῖα οὐ μόνον διότι μένοντα τὰ γραπτὰ ἐλέγχουσιν ἐσαεὶ *πρῶτον πάντων τὸν γράφοντα*, αὐστηρότερον δὲ πάσης ἑτέρας τινὸς μαρτυρίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ διότι κατ' ἰδίαν ἀναγιγνωσκόμενα καὶ προφυλάσσοντα οὕτω τὸν ἀποδέκτην ἀπὸ βλεμμάτων ἀδιακρίτων, πάντως *διὰ τοῦτο* τίθησιν οὗτον καὶ *πρὸ ἑαυτοῦ ὡς ἄλλον* Ἀδὰμ ἀπὸ πάσης δικαιολογίας *αὐτεπιγνώτως γυμνόν*, οὐ δὲ μόνον πρὸ τοῦ νεφροῦς καὶ καρδίας Ἐτάζοντος, Οὕτινος τὴν *φλέγουσαν διαρκὴ παρουσίαν* ἐλάχιστα αἰσθανόμεθα πλέον! Συμφωνήσετε γὰρ ὅτι, *ἐάν οὐδ' αὐτὸ τὸ πρῶτον Ἀδαμίῳ* *συναίσθημα ἐντροπῆς* (ἥτοι συστολῆς ἀπὸ πάσης θρασυτήτος) ἐν ἡμῖν αὐ-

τοῖς συναισθανώμεθα πλέον, ὅλως ἀπώλετο ἢ ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τελειώσεως αἰτία τῆς ὅλης Δημιουργίας καὶ ἐγγὺς Λογικῶς πλέον ἐστὶν ἢ τε Κρίσις καὶ βαρυτάτη δικαία κατάκρισις! [Τὴν ἀρχὴν ταύτην ποιῶμαι τὸ μὲν ὅτι ὡς πάντες κατὰ τὴν ἐπὶ Θεῷ πίστιν λέγομεν ὅτι πολιτευόμεθα, τὸ δ' ὅτι, ἵνα μὴ ἢ ἐπὶ Θεῷ πίστις ὡς ἐπὶ κενῷ ἢ, χρεῖα ἐστὶν ἐπὶ Κεῖνῳ πιστεῦν ὡς ἐπ' αὐτεξουσίῳς ὑπάρχοντι ζῶντι Λογικῷ Δικαίῳ Προσώπῳ, ποιοῦντι οὐδὲν ἄνευ Λογοδοσίας, ἄρ' οὖν καὶ Τελικῆς Κρίσεως!]¹

... ἀναφέρομ' ἐς τὸ λειτούργημα δι' οὗ δημοσίως ἐπιχειρεῖτε, οἶμαι, σῶζειν ἄλλους· ὅπερ οὐκ ἐστίν, ὡς τοιοῦτον, πέραν οἰασδήποτε κριτικῆς! Περὶ αὐτοῦ παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς ὅπως ἐρωτήσητε ἐαυτὸν: Ὁ ἄρα σῶζει ὁ τρόπος ὑμῶν; Ἡ μήπως μᾶλλον ἔτι ἐξαθλιοὶ νοῦς καὶ ψυχὰς ἀπαιδεύτους; Καὶ ποῖαν τὴν Κρίσιν δεῖ ἔσεσθαι τότε; Κατὰ πρόθεσιν, ἢ ἀποτέλεσμα; Πῶς δ' ἢ πρόθεσις ἐστὶν ἀγαθή, δι' ἧς πάντως μόνος ὁ πράττων πιθανῶς σώζεται, ἐὰν οὐδ' ἐπὶ στιγμὴν αὕτη ἀναλογίζεται τὸ δι' ἄλλους πιθανῶς ὀλέθριον ἀποτέλεσμα; Πῶς οὖν διατάξετε τὸ λειτούργημα ...;

Κατὰ τὴν πολλαπλῶς σημαντικὴν παρούσαν στιγμὴν, προέχει, δοκῶ, ὁ οὐσιώδης ἐπανελέγχος τῶν θεμελίων ἐφ' ὧν πάντες οἰκοδομοῦμεν: Πῶς εἰς τὸν Θεὸν μόνον ἀναφερόμενοι κἂν ἐλάχιστ' αὐτὸν μνημονεύοντες, τοσοῦτον ἐλαφρὰν ἂν μὴ καὶ ὅλως αἰσχροὺς τολμῶμεν ποιεῖν τὴν ὅλην "συζήτησιν"; Πῶς δ' ἀληθῶς ἐστὶν αὕτη συζήτησις (κοινὴ σὺν + ζήτησις καὶ ἀναζήτησις, οὐχὶ δέ τις "κουβέντα" πρὸς τὸ κενὸς, κἄρα αἰσχροῦς, ἀναλίσκειν τὸν χρόνον) Ἀληθείας, ὅταν τὰ οὐσιώδη ὅλως περιφρονῶνται; Ὡς ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, τίς ἀληθῶς ἦν οὗτος ὁ Λόγος; Βροτῶν τινα περρόντα ἔπη, ὁ ὅλως κενὸς σήμερον "λόγος" τῶν "φιλολόγων", ὁ ἀσαφὴς "λόγος" τῶν σκοπίμως ὑπονοούντων κακά, ἢ "ἀλήθεια μου κι ἡ ἀλήθεια σου", ὅ,τι ἡμῶν ἕκαστος ἐπιβούλως θεωρεῖ "ἀληθές", ἢ αὕτη ἢ Ἀναρχος, ἕως Ἐσωτάτων Λογικωτάτη, Μία, Ἀδιαίρετος, Πλήρης καὶ Πᾶσα Θεία Οὐσία, ἣν μονολεξεί Θεὸν ὀνομάζομεν; Πῶς οὖν, ὀρθῶς, καὶ Λόγον βραχεῖ ἀλλὰ πλήρει τῷ λόγῳ ταύτην ἀποκαλοῦντες τοσοῦτον δεινῶς παραλογιζόμεθα τοῦ λόγου καταχρῶμενοι οὕτω, κἂν τούτῳ δοκοῦντες ὑπηρετεῖν τὸν Θεόν;

ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΔΗΘΕΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΙΚΗΣ ΚΑΤ' ΑΥΤΗΣ ΑΝΤΙΣΤΑΣΕΩΣ.

Διατὶ πονηρότατ' ἀπὸ τοῦ "666" ἐκκινῶσαι, δι' οὗ ἀφελεῖς ἀλιεύειν ἐπιχειροῦσιν, ἀκούονται σήμερον παρ' οὐδενὸς διελεγχόμενοι δῆθεν "χριστιανικά", δῆθεν "φιλοσοφικά", δῆθεν "λογικά", δῆθεν "εὐσεβεῖς" φωναί, ἀσεβῶς ὠρνόμεναι κατὰ πάσης παρ' οἰουδήποτ' ἀπογραφῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων; Πῶς γὰρ ἀπὸ Χριστιανῶν διαφεύγει ὅτι ἡ ὑπεσχημένη γενικὴ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ Κρίσις ὑπονοεῖ καὶ τὴν γενικὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπογραφὴν, ἥς ἀσφαλῶς τὴν ὁδὸν ἐτοιμάζει ἀνεπιγνώστως, ἐκείνην μόνην προδιαγράφουσα, ἢ παρ' ἀνθρώπων νῦν ἐπιχειρουμένη; Ἀφεύκτως πᾶσα ἀπογραφὴ ἐνέχει τὴν κρίσιν τῶν πραγμάτων ἃ ἀπογράφονται! Κἀφεύκτως, πᾶσα γενικὴ ἡμῶν

¹ Τὸ ἐν ἀγκύλαις, προστιθέμενον τῇ παρουσίᾳ, σκοπεῖ εἰς τὸ ὑπομνησαι παντὶ ἐτέρῳ, οὐσίᾳ ἀγνώστῳ μοι, ἀναγιγνώσκοντι μὴ δ' ὅμως καὶ ἐνσυνειδήτως καταγιγνώσκοντι, ποῖαν ὄντως δεῖ τὴν ἐπὶ Θεῷ πίστιν εἶναι. Οὐκ ἐθεώρησα τὸν κ. Μιχαλόπουλον χρεῖαν ἔχοντα τῆς τοιαύτης προσεπεξηγήσεως.

κρίσις ἐνέχει καὶ ἀπογραφὴν πασῶν τῶν ἡμετέρων πράξεων δι' ἃς ὑπόδικοι κείμεθα! Μὴν ἀπ' ἀμφοτέρων ἐπιχειροῦμεν φυγεῖν; *Πῶς* χριστιανικῶς τοῦτο ποιοῦμεν; *Τί* ἔχει φοβηθῆναι ὁ πιστὸς διαμένων πολίτης, ἐὰν συστελλόμενος καὶ εὐθὺν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ βίον ποιῶν πρὸ τῆς παρούσης ἀνθρωπίνης ἀπογραφῆς-κρίσεως ἔτοιμος εὐρεθῇ καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἐπερχομένης θείας ἀπογραφῆς-Κρίσεως πάντων τῶν πεπραγμένων; Πῶς ἀπὸ τῶν Θεῶ πιστῶν διαφεύγει ἡ ἀδέκαστος Λογική, δι' ἧς, ἐλλειπῶς παρ' αὐτῶν ἐφαρμοζομένης, οὗτοι ἐπιχειροῦσι κρίναι καὶ τοὺς ἀπίστους; Καὶ πῶς διαφεύγει ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπίστων ὅτι *εἰ οὐ Λογικῶς, ἄρ' ἐκβιαστικῶς* ἀπαιτοῦσι πλεονεκτήματα; Οἱ πιστοὶ κρίνονται διὰ τῆς ἀπιστίας αὐτῶν εἰς ὃν Λόγον πιστεύουσιν! Οἱ ἄπιστοι κρίνονται διὰ τῆς ἀπαιτήσεως αὐτῶν τοῦ ἐντυγχάνειν τὰ παράλογ' αὐτῶν ὑπὲρ Λόγον ἐπιθυμήματ' ἀπὸ τοῦ Λόγου εἰς ὃν οὐ πιστεύουσιν! *Πῶς* Χριστιανοὶ ὄντες ὑπερορῶμεν τὴν ὑπὸ τῆς παρούσης ἀπογραφῆς-κρίσεως παρεχομένην ἡμῖν, τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπιτρέποντος, πολύτιμον ὡς ἄνω ὑπηρεσίαν; *Πῶς* γεγόναμεν ἄσοφοι, Χριστιανοὶ ὄντες, καὶ διὰ τῆς γενικῆς ὑμῶν ταύτης ἀρνήσεως ἀπογράφεσθ' ἐπιτρέπομεν ἡμῖν ἑαυτοῖς ὑπηρετεῖν τὸν Ἀντιχρίστου σκοπόν, καὶ διὰ τοῦ τρόπου ἡμῶν τούτου ἐπιχειροῦντος πλανᾶν τοὺς ἀσόφους, τοὺς δῆθεν εὐσεβῶς παραμένοντας μακρὰν τῆς διὰ τῆς ἀπογραφῆς παρεχομένης ἀσκήσεως; Ἀντὶ τοῦ συνέχεσθαι, φωνασκοῦμεν; Ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀκριβεῖς ἐν παντὶ τὰς βίβλους ἀπογραφῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ποιεῖν, ἀρνούμεθα τὴν ἀπογραφὴν καὶ τὴν ὑπηρεσίαν αὐτῆς; Διατεινόμεθα *πιθανὰς* ἀδικίας ἐκ χρήσεως τῆς ἀπογραφῆς; *Πῶς* διατεινόμεθα τοῦτο πιστοὶ ὄντες καὶ πιστοὺς εἶναι πιστεύοντες τὴν συντριπτικὴν πλεονότητα τῶν συμπολιτῶν ἡμῶν, ἥτοι τῶν κατὰ τὸ τεκμήριον τοῦτο πιστῶν ὄντων φυλάκων τῶν ἡμετέρων θεσμῶν τε καὶ νόμων, ὑφ' ὧν καὶ δι' ὧν ἐν δημοκρατίᾳ κρίνονται καὶ οἱ ἐν μειονότητι ἄπιστοι; Οἱ ἐν ἡμῖν ἄπιστοι φοβοῦνται τὴν κακοπιστίαν τῶν πιστῶν; Διατὶ οὐ συνεχόμεθα τρόμῳ πρὸ τῆς δεινοτάτης ταύτης κατηγορίας; Διατὶ πάντες ἀρνούμεθα διορθοῦν τὰς ὁδοὺς ἡμῶν; Ἀνθρώποι ὄντες, ὄντως ὅλως πολύτιμοι καὶ διακεκριμένοι ἐσμέν!² *Πῶς* οὖν ἀφ' ἡμῶν διαφεύγει ὅτι διὰ τοῦτο ἡδὴ ἐσμέν ἀσφαλῶς καταγεγραμμένοι εἰς τὰς παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀσφαλῶς φυλασσομένας βίβλους ζωῆς καὶ "ἀπωλείας" πάντων τῶν πολυτίμων αὐτοῦ, πλην κατὰ μόνα πάντα τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν, οὗ γε τὰ παρ' ἄλλων γραφόμενα περὶ ἡμῶν; Ἀπορεῖτε ὅτι καὶ πάντες πολύτιμοι καὶ τινες ἐξ ἡμῶν τιμωρηθήσονται "εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον"; Ἀλλ' εἰ οὐ πολύτιμοι πῶς καὶ διατηρηθήσονται ἐν "τιμωρίᾳ"; Διατί, εἰ οὐ πολύτιμοι, οὐκ ἀφανισθήσονται ἐς τὸ παντελῶς μὴ πλέον εἶναι; Ὅτι τοιαύτας ἀπορίας ἔτι διατυποῦμεν, ἀδυνατοῦντες κατανοεῖν τὴν καθ' ὅλα Λογικὴν τῶν πραγμάτων διάστασιν καὶ διάταξιν, καταδείκνυσιν πόσον μακρὰν ὄντως ἀπὸ τῆς διὰ τοῦ Λόγου ἐρεύνης τῶν θείων παρεμείναμεν οἱ "πιστοί"! Ὁ Λόγος οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἄπιστος, μόνοι ἡμεῖς! Τί οὖν δεῖ ἐνδιαφέρειν τοὺς ἀληθῶς εὐσεβεῖς; Αἱ βίβλοι τοῦ Θεοῦ ἢ αἱ τῶν ἀνθρώπων; Ἀρα, χριστιανικῶς, φιλοσοφικῶς, καὶ Λογικῶς ἐλεγχόμενος ὁ κατὰ τοῦ "666" ἀγών, ὡς νῦν διεξάγεται, οὐδόλως ἐστὶν οἷος ὥφειλεν εἶναι!

² Ἰδὲ τὰ ὑπὸ πρόθεμα Γ συναφῶς πρὸς τὰς νέας ταυτότητας. [Αὐτὴ ἡ σημείωσις, μὴ οὖσα εἰς τὴν ἐξ ἧς ἐλήφθη τὸ κύριον κείμενον, τίθεται διὰ τὸν τῆς παρούσης σκοπόν].

Η ΠΕΡΙ ΤΑ ΠΑΡ' ΑΝΘΡΩΠΩΝ ΤΗΡΟΥΜΕΝ' ΑΡΧΕΙΑ ΕΝΙΩΝ ΠΙΣΤΩΝ ΣΥΓΧΥΣΙΣ

Ἐρώτημα δεύτερον: *Πῶς τὰ παρ' ἀνθρώπων ποιηροτάτων ποιηρῶς συντασσόμεν' ἀρχεῖα συλλογῆς, ἀναφορᾶς καὶ ταξινομήσεως προσωπικῶν δεδομένων καὶ τῆς διὰ τούτων κατατάξεως τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ οἱ ἐν τοιούτοις ἀρχεῖοις τοῖς ἀνθρώποις διδόμενοι αὖξοντες ἀριθμοὶ ὑποχρεοῦσι τὸν Κριτὴν Κύριον εἰς τὸ καταδικάσειν τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς; Ὑπάρχει ἐπὶ τούτου ἔστω ἐν τοῦ Θεοῦ-Λόγου δεσμευτικὸν ἐπιχείρημα δικαιολογοῦν τὰς ἀνυσηχίας τῶν ἀγαθῶν; Μὴν ἄρα, περὶ τοῦτο κυρίως πλὴν ἀσόφως ἀνυσηχοῦντες καὶ περισπῶμενοι, παρορῶμεν καὶ ἀδιαφοροῦμεν περὶ τὰς μεγάλας ἀδικίας τὰς διὰ τοιούτων μέσων διαπραττομένας καὶ ἐτοιμαζόμενας, καὶ παραχωροῦμεν τὸ ἔδαφος εἰς ἀδίκους, ἅπερ ὧντως ἐστὶ καταδικαστέα;*

Ἐρώτημα τρίτον: *Πῶς ὁ ὅλος διάτρητος πνευματικῶς κοινωνικὸς ἡμῶν βίος μαρτυρεῖ ἡμᾶς καὶ Ἕλληνας καὶ Χριστιανοὺς Ὁρθοδόξους, ὥστε πείθειν τοὺς παρατηροῦντας ἡμᾶς; Διατί ἐὰν δικαίως καταφερώμεθα κατὰ τῆς γενικῆς τηρήσεως ἀρχείων, οὔτε ποτ' ἠναντιώθημεν κατὰ τῶν ληξιαρχείων, οὔτε νῦν κατ' αὐτῶν ἀνθιστάμεθα; Πῶς δῆθεν σοφῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν διέφυγεν ἀφ' ἡμῶν ὅτι πιθανὴ δεινῶν ἀρχὴ ἦν ταῦτα, φύσει εἰς "συμπλήρωσιν τῶν στοιχείων" ἡμῶν ὁδηγοῦντα, πλὴν μόνον ἐὰν κακῆς χρήσεως τύχωσι, καθ' ἧς μόνης οὐ καλῶς φυλάσσομεν ταῦτα; Πῶς ἄρ' ἡ συλλογὴ καὶ τήρησις τῶν ἀρχείων ἐστὶ καταδικαστέα; Μὴν οὐ καθίστησι δυνατὴν καὶ τὴν καλὴν ὡς καὶ τὴν κακὴν αὐτῶν χρῆσιν; Πῶς ἰστάμεθα σὺν Θεῷ αἰτούμενοι τὴν κατάργησιν τῶν ἀρχείων φοβούμενοι τὴν κακὴν αὐτῶν χρῆσιν, πλὴν ἐν τούτῳ ἀδιαφοροῦντες διὰ τὰγαθὸν ἀποτέλεσμα τὴν καλῆς αὐτῶν χρήσεως; Μὴν ἀπὸ μόνης νωθρότητος ἀγόμεθα γενικῶς κατὰ τῶν ἀρχείων, διότι ἐν τῇ οὐσίᾳ οὐκ ἐπιθυμοῦμεν καταβάλλειν τὸν κόπον τῆς καλῆς αὐτῶν τηρήσεως τε καὶ χρήσεως; Λησμονοῦμεν τὴν ἐν ὕμνοις ἀναφορὰν εἰς τὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ Καίσαρος Αὐγούστου διαταχθεῖσαν γενικὴν τῶν ὑπὸ τὴν Ῥώμην ἀνθρώπων ἀπογραφὴν; Πᾶν ὅπερ ἐστὶ Λογικόν, αἰεὶ ἐστὶ Λογικόν! Πᾶν ὅπερ ἀτελές ἐστὶ διαμένον ἀνοκλήρωτον, Λογικόν ἐστὶν ὀλοκληροῦσθαι! Οὐδέν ἐστὶν Ὁρθόδοξον ὅπερ ἐστὶ παράλογον! Πῶς ταῦτα τὰ ἀπλούστατα διαφεύγει ἀπὸ τοῦ νοῦ Ὁρθοδόξου; Διατί ἡ Ἐκκλησία ἀπαιτεῖ ἀπὸ τοῦ Κράτους μόνον τὰ ἐν νωθρότητ' ἀνώδυνα, καὶ οὐκ ἀπαιτεῖ συμμετοχὴν δι' ἀνθρώπων αὐτῆς ἀκεραιοτάτων καὶ εἰδημόνων εἰς τὴν Ἀρχὴν Προστασίας καὶ Καλῆς Φυλάξεως τε καὶ Χρήσεως τῶν Προσωπικῶν δεδομένων· ἐγκαταλείπουσα οὕτως αὐτὰ εἰς τὴν διάκρισιν ἀνθρώπων ἀπίστων, περὶ ὧν δικαιοῦτ' ἀμφιβάλλειν ἄλλ' οὐ τολμᾷ δημοσίᾳ ὁμολογεῖν, χάριν δῆθεν "ἀγάπης" καὶ "καλῶν" κοινωνικῶν σχέσεων; Διατί τὰ προσωπικά δεδομένα ἐνὸς ἐκάστου ἡμῶν δεῖ παραμένειν ἀπόρρητ' ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς οὓς ἀναφέρονται (ἢ προσβάσιμα μόνον κατόπιν καταβολῆς ἀδροῦ τέλους); Πῶς οὕτω διαφυλάσσεται ἡ τούτων ἀλήθεια (καὶ πῶς ἡ ἰσονομία περὶ τὴν πρόσβασιν, ὅταν οἱ παντοειδεῖς ἰσχυροὶ καὶ "ἡμέτεροι" τοῦ συστήματος οὐδὲν ἀσφαλῶς συναντήσωσι πρόσκομμα περὶ τὸν ἔλεγχον καὶ μεταβολὴν ὧνπερ στοιχείων ἐπιθυμήσωσιν ἄν, καὶ ἐξαίρεθῶσιν ἀπὸ τῆς καταβολῆς τοῦ τέλους προσβάσεως, κατὰ τὰ μέχρι τοῦδε παρ' ἡμῖν διοικητικὰ πάγια πλὴν αἰσχροῦ, καθ' ὧν οὐδεὶς ὁμιλεῖ ἢ σπουδαίως ἀμύνεται); Καὶ*

πὼς ἀγνοεῖθ' ὅτι ἡ παρ' οἰουδήποτε χρήσις αὐτῶν συνίστησιν οἰοεὶ δίκην καὶ καταδίκην ἐρήμην παρ' ἀγνώστου κριτοῦ, πάντων τῶν στοιχείων τῆς δίκης, κατηγορητηρίου καὶ καταδίκης παραμεινόντων ἀγνώστων εἰς τὸν εἰς ὃν ἀναφέρονται;

Ἐρώτημα τέταρτον: *Πὼς Ὁρθόδοξ' ἐσμέν πιστεύοντες καὶ ἐνεργοῦντες μὲν ὡς ἔως τοῦ νῦν, ὁμῶς δ' οὐδόλως ἐνδιαφερόμενοι περί, ἀλλὰ μάλλον ἀρνούμενοι συνεινεῖσθαι μετὰ, τῶν λοιπῶν ἀνθρώπων ὥστε πρὸ πάντων αὐτῶν φέρειν τὸ πανανθρώπινον τοῦτο πρόβλημα διαβιώσεως ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ζωῇ καὶ σωτηρίας ἐν τῇ ἐπομένῃ;* Μὴν ἐνεργοῦντες ἀπὸ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀποκεκομμένως καθιστάμεθ' εἰς εὐκολονομίαν τῶν κατὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων βυσσοδομούντων, καὶ οὐσίᾳ ὑπηρετοῦμεν τοὺς ἐκείνων σκοπούς; *Ποῦ* ἐστὶν ἡ διὰ τῆς ἐπὶ Θεῷ πίστεως ἡμῶν εὐφυΐα; *Διατί*, εἰ ὄντως Ὁρθόδοξοι, οὐκ ἀναλαμβάνομεν τὴν πνευματικὴν ἡγεσίαν τοῦ κόσμου παντός, περιοριζόμενοι εἰς τὰ στενὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς; Μὴν ἡ ὅλη πνευματικὴ πορεία καὶ ὁκνηρία ἡμῶν ἀνετοίμους ἡμᾶς ἡνεγκον εἰς τοὺς παρόντας καιροὺς, ἐνῷ οἱ ἐχθροὶ Θεοῦ τε κἀνθρώπων καλῶς πρὸς πόλεμον ἡτοιμάζοντο; Πρὸς Θεοῦ, τί ἕτερον ἀναμένομεν; *Διατί* οὐκ ἐσμεν ἐν παντὶ σώφρονες ὡς οἱ ὄφεις, ἀλλ' εἰς μόνας ἀρκούμεθ' αἰσχροῦς φωνασκίας καὶ ὕβρεις; *Πὼς* πρὸς τὸν Θεόν ἐστι ταῦτα; *Πὼς* δὲ τιμᾷ; Καὶ *πὼς* ἀγιάζει; Ἀγωνιῶ!

Ἡ Ἀποκάλυψις (ιγ, 11-18) περιγράφει τὰ *(κατὰ τὴν συγγραφὴν αὐτῆς ἐπικείμενα καὶ) γενησόμεν'* ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄλλου (ἡγουν, δευτέρου) θηρίου, ὅπερ "τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ πρώτου θηρίου πᾶσαν ποιεῖ". *Ποῦ* ἐστὶ καταγεγραμμένη, καὶ *πὼς* ἐξυπονοεῖται τῷ Λόγῳ συνάδουσα, ἡ *ρήτῃ ἐντολῇ (ἥντινά τινες ἡμῶν δέχονται δεδομένην) βιαίας ἀντιστάσεως* κατὰ τῶν ἐκεῖ περιγραφομένων, καὶ δὴ καθ' ὃν ἦκιστα κόσμιον καὶ Θεοῦ βλάσφημον τρόπον τινὲς ἡμῶν διεξάγουσι τὸν κατὰ τῶν θηρίων ἐκείνων "ἀγῶνα", οὐδόλως κατὰ τὴν ὅψιν ἣ καὶ τὰ μέσ' ἀπὸ κείνων διαφέροντες; Αἱ Ἀθηναί [ἡ πόλις ἡ ἀφιερωμένη εἰς τὴν Θεοῦ Νόησιν] κυλίουτ' ἐν ἀπορρίμμασί τε καὶ περιπτώμασι! Περιβαλλόμεθα πανταχόθεν ὑπὸ περισσῆς ἀσχημίας καὶ ῥυπαρότητος, δι' ὧν βλασφημοῦμεν τὸν Θεόν καὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον! Μόνοι βάρβαροι βεβηλοῦσι τὴν καθαρότητα! Ἐν τούτοις συγκαταλλέγονται καὶ οἱ κατὰ τοῦ "666" δῆθεν "πατριῶται καὶ Ὁρθόδοξοι Χριστιανοί"! Βεβηλοῦσι διὰ συνθημάτων πᾶσαν καθαρὰν ἐπιφάνειαν! "Ἴνα μὴ ὅμως ὁ ἄξεστος "Λαὸς" προσβληθῇ, οὐδὲ περὶ τούτου τῶν "ἡγετῶν" τις διδάσκει αὐτόν! "Ἀρα, καὶ οἱ ἡγέται ἡμῶν ἀποδέχονται ὡς τιμὴν τὴν κατασχύνην τῆς τῆς πόλεως ῥυπαρότητος! Διερωτώμαι: "Ἀρα θελήσετε δημοσίως ἀπαιτήσιν ὅπως οἱ διαπράξαντες, συναισθανόμενοι τὴν μεγάλην ἐπιπρόσθετον ἐντροπὴν ἣν διὰ τοῦ τρόπου αὐτοῦ προκαλοῦσιν εἰς τὸ δυστυχέστατον ἡμῶν ἔθνος, ἐπανέλθωσιν εἰς τοὺς τόπους τῶν ἐγκλημάτων αὐτῶν καὶ ἀποκαθάρωσιν αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν μiasμάτων αὐτῶν; Φοβοῦμαι ὅτι σπείραντες ἀνέμους ἐπ' ἀπαιδεύτων, νῦν συλλέγετε τὰς δικαίας ἀγρίας θυέλλας! Πρὸς Θεοῦ, *πὼς* δοκεῖτε ὅτι ὑπηρετεῖτε Θεὸν ὅταν ὡς συνέπεια τῶν λόγων ὑμῶν τὸ "Ἅγιον αὐτοῦ Ὄνομα βλασφήμως ἀναγράφῃται ἐπὶ τῶν τοίχων, μετὰ μυρίων λοιπῶν βδελυγμάτων, ὡς ἑτέρα τις ῥυπαρότης; Ἐὰν ὄντως πιστεύητε εἰς Θεόν, οὐδὲν ἄλλο περὶ τούτου τοῦ κόσμου πιστεύειν ὑμῖν ἔξεστιν, ἢ ὅτι οὗτος παρήχθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς ἐτοι-

μασίαν Πολιτῶν Παραδείσου! Ἔστιν ἡ ὡς ἄνω, μία ἀπὸ μυρίων περιγραφείσα, μέθοδος ἐτοιμασίας Πολιτῶν Παραδείσου; Ἐτοιμάζει οὗτος ὁ τόπος, ἡ πᾶσα ἡ γῆ, Πολίτας τοῦ Παραδείσου; Ἐπειδὴ οἱ "εὐλαβούμενοι" ἄπερ οὐδόλως κατανοοῦσι; Ποία ἡμῶν ἔσεται ἡ ἀπολογία; Πῶς ἀπαίδευτοι διαμεΐναντες εὐρεθησόμεθ' ἐν Παραδείσῳ; Τίς ἡμᾶς ἐμποδίζει κακεῖ ποιεῖν ἀνάλογα τῶν ὧδε παρ' "εὐσεβῶν" διδασκόντων ἡμῖν; Ἐπειδὴ κἂν Παραδείσῳ ἔστιν ἀστυνομία; Πῶς τοιοῦτοι ἀλῆται γεγονάμεν, τοιαῦτα πιστεύοντες καὶ ποιοῦντες; Πῶς ἄρα τοιαῦτα ὧδε μαθόντες ποιεῖν, δόκιμοι Παραδείσου ἐσόμεθα; Ἡ ἐροῦμεν ὅτι "πιστεύομεν, ἄρα καὶ δικαιούμεθα" κατὰ τὰ νῦν αἰσχυρῶς παρ' ἀληθῶν ἀπαιτούμενα; Ἀλλὰ πῶς ταῦτ' ἀληθῆ μαρτυρεῖ τὴν δῆθεν "Ὁρθόδοξον" ἡμῶν πίστιν;

Κατὰ τὴν κοινὴν τοῦ κ. Ι. Χατζηφώτη καὶ ὑμῶν ἐμφάνισιν τῆς 3ης Φεβρ. 1998 "στο γυαλί", ἐκεῖνος εἰς ἀπάντησιν ἐρωτήσεως εἶπεν, ὑμῶν συμφωνούντος, τοῦτο τὸ δῆθεν θεολογικῶς βαθυστόχαστον πλὴν φοβερὸν ὅτι αὐξων ἀριθμὸς λαμβανόμενος, κἂν 666 ᾖ, εἰς οὐδέν ἐστι, "διότι ἡ Γραφή λέγει [ἄρα δ' οὖν καθ' ὑμᾶς ἀμφοτέρους καὶ ἀπαιτεῖ!] τὸ χξς, καὶ οὐχὶ τὸ 666"! Σκοπῶς ἐλησμονήσατε καὶ ὅτι ἡ Γραφή ἀναφέρει τὸ χξς οὐχὶ ὡς ἀπλοῦν ἀριθμὸν ἀλλ' ὡς ἀριθμὸν ὀνόματος [ἀριθμὸν ἀντιστοιχοῦντα εἰς τὸ ὄνομα] τοῦ τε θηρίου γὰρ καὶ τάνθρώπου τοῦ τοῦτο φέροντος, καλοῦσα τὸν νοῦν ἔχοντα "ψηφίσ[αι] τὸν ἀριθμὸν" [τουτέστι τὸ ὄνομα] ἀκριβῶς ἵνα κατανοήσῃ τὴν σημασίαν τοῦ ὀνόματος, καὶ ὅτι τὸ 666 ἐστὶν ἡ ἀραβικὴ γραφή μὴ τότε ὑπάρχουσα τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ χξς! Ἀσφαλῶς ὡς ἀπλοῦς ἀριθμὸς τὸ 666 εἰς οὐδέν ἐστιν! Ἀλλὰ τότε πρὸς τί πᾶς ὁ κατὰ τοῦ ἀπλοῦ ἀριθμοῦ 666 (καββαλιστικῶς οὐχὶ ὀρθοδόξως ὑφ' ὑμῶν λαμβανόμενος) καὶ τῶν νέων ταυτοτήτων μέγας ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν σὺν ὑμῖν θόρυβος; Τί ἐπὶ τέλους, ἐάν τι, ἀναγραφῆσεται ἐπὶ τῶν νέων ταυτοτήτων, τὸ χξς ἢ τὸ 666; Τί οἱ λοιποί, νῦν δὲ καὶ ἡ κ. Δουράκη, νέα αὕτη ἀποκαλύπτρια, παρουσιάζουσιν ὡς ἀριθμὸν τοῦ θηρίου, τὸ χξς ἢ τὸ 666; Ἐγὼ πάντως οὐδέποτε ἤκουσ' ἀνάλογον, ἵνα μὴ χεῖρον εἶπω, *casuistic "reasoning"* παρ' οἰουδήποτ' ἐκπροσώπου ἐκκλησίας τινός! Ὅτι τοῦτο ἐλέχθη παρ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ τύπου ἐπισήμου ἐκπροσώπου τῆς ἐν Ἑλλάδι φερομένης ὡς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας, μαρτυρεῖ τὸ πόσον ὀλίγα φεῦ νῦν αὕτη συμμαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐαυτῆς, τοιαῦτα ἐπ' ὀνόματι Κεῖνου ἐπιτρέπουσα λέγεσθαι! Τί δοκεῖτε; Ὅτι μεταφραζομένης τῆς Γραφῆς εἰς ἄλλην τινὰ γλῶσσαν, τὸ χξς διατηρεῖται ὡς ἐν τῷ πρωτοτύπῳ, ἢ ὅτι καὶ τὸ μεταφράζεται; Μὴ κενὰ καὶ "δόγματα" εἰσηγοῦνται οἱ παρ' ἡμῖν ἐν τῷ Λόγῳ ἀπαίδευτοι αὐταποδεικνύμενοι διαμεΐναντες "Ὁρθόδοξοι θεολόγοι", ἵνα διαφύγωσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐλέγχου τοῦ Λόγου, οὐδ' ἐπὶ στιγμὴν αἰσχυρόμενοι διὰ τὴν βαρεῖαν ἀπάτην ἣν οὕτω διαπράττουσιν ἀσυστόλως; Ὡς ἀριθμὸς μὲν τὸ χξς ἀναγράφεται ὀλογράφως ὡς "ἑξακόσια καὶ ἑξήκοντα ἕξ". Πῶς ὅμως αὐτὸ ἀναγράφεται ὀλογράφως ὡς ὄνομα; Διὰ τὴν ἀντὶ Λογικῆς ἀπαντήσεως ἀκούομεν μόνον ἀνοησίας; Κατὰ τὸν ὡς ἄνω τρόπον τοῦ κ. Ι. Χατζηφώτη (μεθ' οὗ συνεφωνήσατε), ὡς ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πράγματος πλέον ὅλως ἐλλείπει, τὸ χξς παραμένει μόνον ὡς σύνθημα γυμνὸν σημασίας [αὐστηρῶς ἐλληνικὸν κατὰ τὴν γραφὴν αὐτοῦ ὅμως! Ὡς τῆς καπηλείας πατρίδος καὶ θεῶν!], ἀκατάληπτον πᾶσιν, ὡς καὶ τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν, ὡς οὐδεὶς πλέον

"ἔχ[ει] νοῦν ψηφί[ζειν καὶ κατανοεῖν] τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ [δευτέρου] θηρίου· [ὅς] ἀριθμὸς γὰρ ἀνθρώπου ἐστί[ν]"! Ἀλλ' εἰ ὅντως τὰ πράγματ' ἔχει ὡς διατείνεσθε (μήπως ὅμως ἵν' καλύψητε τὴν ἀπουσίαν τοῦ νοῦ;) πῶς ἂρ' οὐκ ἀδιαφορεῖ ὁ Θεὸς περὶ τῶν ψυχῶν τῶν ἀδυνατούντων κατανοῆσαι τὸ καθ' ὑμᾶς ἀμετάφραστον ἑλληνικὸν σύνθημα; Μὴ διὰ τοῦτο μετέρχεται τῶν γριφωδῶν καὶ κρυφίων τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως, ἥτις οὐδὲν ὅμως ἀποκαλύπτει ἄνευ τινὸς νοῦ ἀνταποδεικνυμένων τῶν ἐπὶ ταῦτα ταχθέντων; Πῶς ἐστι πάντα ταῦτα Χριστιανικά, Ὁρθόδοξα, Λογικά, σὺν Θεῷ; Μὴ καὶ διὰ τῶν φερομένων ὡς "Ὁρθόδοξων" ἔτι καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν σιωπηρῶς βασιλεύει ἡ ἐβραϊκὴ καββαλιστικὴ ἀριθμολογία, ἣν ἀκατανοήτως οὗτοι προσυπογράφουσιν; Ἐὰν ταῦτα πάντα λέγεται Λόγος Θεοῦ καὶ Ἀγάπης, ἀσφαλῶς οὐκέτι πλέον ἐστὶ τις αἰδῶς παρ' ἡμῖν!

ΠΡΟΤΕΙΝΟΜΕΝΗ ΑΝΑΓΝΩΣΙΣ ΤΩΝ ΕΝ ΤΗ ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΕΙ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΑΡΙΘΜΟΥ 666

Πῶς οὖν σοφοὶ "Θεολόγοι" τινες διατείνονται εἶναι, οὕτω καββαλιστικῶς ἐπὶ τοῦ "666" προσκολλώμενοι, ὅμως οὐδένα νοῦν ἔχοντες οὐδεμίαν διδόασιν ἐξήγησιν Λογικὴν τοῦ ἐκ Θεοῦ δῆθεν "κρυφίου" τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως, ἐνῷ, οὐσίᾳ, "ὄμφακας" ὀνομάζουσι τὸ "ὥδε ἡ σοφία ἐστίν· ὁ ἔχων νοῦν ψηφισάτω τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ [δευτέρου] θηρίου· ἀριθμὸς γὰρ ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶ· καὶ ὁ ἀριθμὸς [τοῦ ἀνθρώπου] αὐτοῦ χξς'"; Πῶς ἂρ' ὁ Θεός, ἐνανθρωπήσας ἵν' Αὐτὸν ἀποκαλύψῃ ἡμῖν, ἀπελθὼν εἰς κρυφίας κάνεξηγήτους ἐπανῆλθε μεθόδους, διὰ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου δοὺς ἡμῖν τὴν κατὰ τοὺς "Θεολόγους" αὐτοὺς οὐδὲν ἀποκαλύπτουσιν Ἀποκάλυψιν; Οὕτως, ἐμφατικώτατα! Μὴν ἄρα διὰ ταύτης ἠθέλησεν ἡμᾶς νοῦν ἔχειν, κάει τοὺς καιροὺς μελετᾶν τε καὶ ἐρμηνεύειν; Ἀσφαλέςτατα! Διότι μόνον οὕτως ἀληθῶς ἀποκαλύπτει ἡ Ἀποκάλυψις, κάποφεύγεται ἡ κατὰ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος βλασφημία! Πῶς οὖν σοφοὺς λέγοντες ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς καὶ τοσοῦτον καταλεπτῶς ἐκλαμβάνοντες πᾶσαν τῆς Γραφῆς λέξιν, τὸ μὲν χξς' ἐπιμένομεν τηρεῖν ἀμετάφραστον, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ πιστεύειν σημαντικόν, τὰ δ' ὑπὸ τούτου καὶ τῆς ὅλης αὐτὸ εἰσαγαγούσης περιόδου καὶ παραγράφου σημαινόμενα πεισματικῶς ὑπερорώμεν ὡς "ὄμφακας"; Τί οὖν σημαίνει κείνο τὸ "ψηφισάτω", κατὰ προστακτικὴν ἀορίστου λεγόμενον; Ὅτι οὐχὶ αἰεὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι εὐρεθήσεται τὰ λεγόμενα, ἡμῶν καλουμένων ψηφίσαι, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐπελεύσεται ὥρα ὅτε τὰ προπεριγραφόμεν' ἄπερ ἐξετάσαι καλούμεθα εἰς τὸ παρελθὸν ἡμῶν εὐρεθήσεται, οὕτω γυμνὰ πρὸ ἡμῶν κείμενα! Μὴν ἂρ' ἤδη ἐλήλυθεν ἐφ' ἡμῶν κοιμωμένων ἡ ὥρα ἐκείνη; Τί οὖν ἕτερον διὰ τούτου ἐπίσης σημαίνεται; Ὅτι γνωστοὺς πρὸ ἡμῶν τοὺς ἀριθμοὺς ἔχομεν, δι' ὧν τὸ συγκεκριμένον [δεύτερον] ἐκείνο] θηρίον τὸ ποιοῦν ἐκεῖνα τὰ φοβερά διαχωρίσαι καλούμεθα! Ἀλλ' οἱ ἀριθμοὶ τίνων εἰσὶ; Μόνων ἀνθρώπων γε! Ὅτι οὕτω μόνον κἀκεῖνο τὸ "ἀριθμὸς γὰρ ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶ[ν]" ἐξηγείται! Ὡς ὅτι, ἄρα, ἄνθρωπος τὸν ἀριθμὸν χξς' φέρων τὸ [δεύτερον] ἐκεῖνο] θηρίον ἐστίν, οὐχὶ δέ τις κρυφία τοῦ σατανᾶ ἐνανθρώπησις, ὡς περιδεεῖς ἀνόητοι ὑποβάλλουσι, σχεδὸν ἰσοθείας δυνάμεις ὑπονοοῦντες αὐτὸν ἔχειν, τὸν Θεὸν βλασφημοῦντες! Τί δ' ἕτερον ἐπίσης σημαίνεται; Ὅτι ἐὰν δι' ἀριθμῶν μόνων δέη ψηφίσαι ἡμᾶς, ἀναγ-

καία τότ' ἐστὶν καὶ ἡ λεπτομερὴς τε καὶ ἀκριβὴς ἀπαρίθμησις τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ παρομοία καταγραφὴ τῶν πράξεων ἐκάστου αὐτῶν, δι' ὧν μόνων ἀποκαλυφθήσεται τὸ θηρίον· οὐδ' ἡ ἀποκάλυψις καὶ ὁ κολασμὸς ἐμποδίζεται καὶ ἡ ὑπόληψις αὐτοῦ νῦν προστατεύεται ὡς καὶ παρ' αὐτῶν ὡσαύτως τῶν διὰ δῆθεν θρησκευτικούς λόγους ἀρνούμενων τὴν ἀπαρίθμησιν καὶ καταγραφὴν!

Πλὴν ὅμως, ὅτι ἐτέραν καὶ μάλ' ὀρθοτέραν, ἐγῶμαι, μέθοδον εἰσηγεῖται ὁ Ἰωάννης: "Ὅτι ὡς πάντας τοὺς νοῦν ἔχοντας ἐπὶ τὸ ψηφίσει οὗτος καλεῖ, ἀλλ' οὐκ αἰεὶ, οὐδ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν, ἕκαστος τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀριθμὸν ἓνα κὰν καυθαίρετον φέρει, ἵνα μὴ ἡ εἰσῆγησις μένη ἀπόκρυφος κἄρ' ἀδύνατον ποιῇσαι τὸ εἰσηγούμενον· ἄρα κατ' ὄνομα ὥσπερ πάντες αἰεὶ ἔχομεν ὄνομα, καὶ τὸν ἀντιστοιχοῦντ' αὐτῷ ἀριθμὸν, πᾶσι τοῖς νοῦν ἔχουσι καταληπτῆς οὕτως οὐσης τῆς εἰσηγήσεως, καλούμεθα ψηφίσει τὸν σημαινόμενον· κατὰ τὴν μόνην μέχρι τοῦδ' ἐπὶ τοῦτο ὑπάρχουσιν, ἑλληνικὴν μέθοδον, ἣν μόνην πάντως ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐγνώριζε! Καὶ εἰ ὁ σημαινόμενος ἑλληνικὸν ὄνομα φέρει, καλῶς! Τί ὅμως εἰ οὗτος οὐχ ἑλληνικὸν ὄνομα φέρει; Ἀλλὰ τί πάλιν ἐροῦμεν καὶ περὶ τούτου; Ὅτι δεῖ ἡμᾶς λαμβάνειν τὰ ὀνόματα ὡς συνθήματα σημασίας κενά, ἢ κατὰ σημασίαν, ἣτις ἑλληνιστὶ καταγεγραμμένη καὶ ψηφισομένη αὐτομάτως εἰς ἀριθμὸν μεταφράζεται; Περὶ μὲν τὰ συνθήματα, ἢ ἀνυπαρξία δυνατότητος ἀκριβοῦς μεταγλωττίσεως πάντων τῶν ὀνομάτων, μεταβαλλομένης κατὰ τὴν ὑφ' ἐκάστου ἐκάστοτ' ἀποδεκτὴν σύμβασιν, συνίστησι καταφανῆ μείζονα κἀνυπέρβλητον δυσκολίαν! Περὶ δ' ὅμως τὴν σημασίαν, οὐδεμία ἀνυπέρβλητος δυσκολία ὑπάρχει, ὡς αἱ ἑλληνικαὶ λέξεις αἰεὶ σημαίνουσαι τὰς ἐννοίας οὐκ εἰσὶν ἄπειροι τὸν ἀριθμὸν! Κατὰ σημασίαν οὖν ἄρα, οὐ κατὰ σύνθημα, δεῖ λαμβάνεσθαι τὰ ὀνόματα! Ἀλλ' ἔστω τις ἀποκαλυπτόμενος κατὰ συνωνυμίαν ἔχων μὲν τὸν διαβόητον ἀριθμὸν, ἄγνωστος κἄσῃμος ὅμως τυγχάνων, ὡς τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ πόρρω ἀπὸ τῶν περιγραφόμενων ἀπέχει. Πῶς λογικῶς οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ζητούμενος; Ἄρα μεγάλως μειοῦται ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν ὀνομάτων, ἐν οἷς καὶ τὸ τοῦ σημαινομένου συγκαταλέγεται, πρὸς ἃ τὰ περιγραφόμενα ἔργ' ἀντιστοιχεῖ! Μὴ καὶ ἐτέραν, δι' ἔργων ἔνδειξιν τοῦ σημαινομένου σημαντικὴν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἡμῖν ἔδωκεν; Ἀσφαλῶς! Διότι ὡς ἀρνίον κέρατα δύο ἐπὶ κεφαλῆς ἔχον πλὴν ὡς δράκοντα λαλοῦντα περιγράφει τὸ δεύτερον ἐκεῖνο θηρίον, τουτέστιν αὐτὸν τὸν ζητούμενον ἄνθρωπον! Ἀλλὰ διατί οὕτω; Διότι οὐκ ἄνθρωπος ἃ ὅπωπεν ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλὰ θηρίον, τέρας καὶ πονηρὸς δράκων ὄντως ἐστὶ πᾶς ὁ ὑπὲρ Θεὸν βουλόμενος ὑψοῦν ἑαυτόν! Τοῦτο νῦν ἐρωτᾶται: Πότε οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἰς δράκοντας δρακοντείως λαλοῦντας ἐνεπιστεύθησαν ἑαυτοὺς, ἢ ἐποίησαν καθ' ἃ κείνοι τούτους διετάξαν; Οὐδέποτε γε! Ἄρα, τὰ λαλούμενα παρ' αὐτοῦ οὐδόλως τρομάζουσι τοὺς πλείστους ἀκούοντας, ἀλλὰ μόνους τοὺς ὀλίγους καλῶς ἀντιλαμβανομένους τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν λαλιῶν αὐτοῦ σημαινόμενα φοβερά! Ὅτι εἰ δρακοντείως ὁ δράκων ἐλάλη, καὶ ὡς δράκων ἐφαίνετο ἄν· ἀλλ' οὐδένα τότ' ἂν ἐξηπάτη, κἀπὸ τοῦ σκοποῦ αὐτοῦ ἀπετύγχανεν ἄν! Ὅτι, ἄρα, ὡς δῆθεν ἄκακον ἀρνίον βελάζει ὡσὶν ἀπαιδεύτοις, ὡς ἄλλως καὶ φαίνεται, ἵνα

τοῦ σκοποῦ αὐτοῦ ἐπιτύχη, καὶ ὡς τοιοῦτον παρὰ τῶν ἀφελῶν ἐκλαμβάνεται τῶν μὴ κατανοούντων τὴν σημασίαν τῶν λαλιῶν αὐτοῦ, *παρ' ὅσα φοβερά πλην αὐτοῖς κρύφια ὡς γνήσιος δράκων σημαίνει! Διὰ τοῦτο τοιούτως* (ὡς ἀρνίον κέρατα ἔχον ἀλλ' ὡς δράκων λαλοῦν) οὗτος περιεγράφη!: Ἀρνίον λαλοῦν βελασμούς, ἀλλὰ *βλασφημίας* σημαίνουν κατὰ τοῦ ζῶντος Θεοῦ! Καθ' αὐτά, τὰ περιγραφόμενα *φαινόμεν'* αὐτοῦ ἔργα [καὶ τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ πρώτου θηρίου *πάσαν ποιεῖ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ. καὶ ποιεῖ τὴν γῆν καὶ τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ κατοικοῦντας ἵνα προσκυνήσωσι τὸ θηρίον τὸ πρῶτον ... καὶ ποιεῖ σημεῖα μεγάλα, ἵνα καὶ πῦρ ποιῇ καταβαίνειν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰς τὴν γῆν ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων. καὶ πλανᾷ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς διὰ τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ποιῆσαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ (πρώτου) θηρίου]* οὐ μόνον *εὐθεῖαν* συνίστησι βολὴν κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλ' *ἔστι καὶ παράγωγα τῶν βλασφημιῶν!* Πόσαι καὶ τίνες εἰσὶν αἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ προβαλλόμεναι βλασφημίαι, αἵτινες ὡς ἀγαθοὶ βελασμοὶ παρὰ τῶν ἀφελῶν ἐκλαμβάνονται; *Ἴδε κείνα τὰ κέρατα!* Ὡς ταῦτα δύο ἐκφύονται ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ ἀρνίου, οὕτω κἀκεῖναι δύο ἀνέφυσαν ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς (ἡγουν τοῦ νοῦ) τοῦ δευτέρου θηρίου! *Πῶς οὖν οὐχ ἱκανῶς εἰκονίζεται παρ' Ἰωάννου ὁ δράστης; Διατί οὖν οἱ "Θεολόγοι" ὑπερ-ορώσι τὴν εἰκόνα ἣν ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν Ἰωάννης, προσκολλώμενοι ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀκροτελευτίου "666", ᾧ διδόασιν κρυφίαν καββαλιστικὴν σημασίαν; Διατί ἀρνοῦντ' εὐρὺν ρίψαι* τὸ βλέμμα αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τῶν ἤδη γεγενημένων, δι' ὧν ὁ ἀρνιοδράκων ἤδη ἐποίησε τοὺς ἐπὶ γῆς κατοικοῦντας ἵνα προσκυνήσωσι τὸ πρῶτον θηρίον, οὓς περισσῶς ἤδη ἐπλάνησε διὰ τῶν ἐὼν μεγάλων σημείων δι' ὧν ἵνα καὶ πῦρ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰς τὴν γῆν καταβαίνει *ἤδη ἐποίησε;* Τοσοῦτον τυφλοὶ οὖν εἰσιν οἱ νῦν ἐπιφανεῖς "Χριστιανοὶ Θεολόγοι", παρὰ τοῦτ' ἀπαιτοῦντες ὁδηγεῖν τοὺς ἔτι τυφλοτέρους ἡμῶν; *Εἰδάλλως, διατί σιωπῶσιν ἀρνούμενοι παρὰ τὴν αὐτοῖς γεγρονίαν ὑπόδειξιν ὀνομάσαι τὸν δράκοντα,* ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχῶν τοῦ παρόντος αἰῶνος δρακοντεῖως ἱστάμενον πρό, καὶ μεγάλως τιμώμενον ὑπό, τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς κατοικούντων; Πῶς οἱ τοῦ παρόντος αἰῶνος τοῦ ὑπὲρ πάντας ἀπατεῶνος "σοφοὶ" ἐν περισσῇ ἀσοφίᾳ νῦν συλλαμβάνονται!

B. ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΣΥΝΘΗΚΗΣ SCHENGEN

Περὶ δὲ νῦν τὴν συνθήκην **Schengen**, ἔγωγ' ἐν μεγάλῃ ἀπορίᾳ εὐρίσκομαι: Ἵνα τοῖς ἐμοῦ πεισθῶ ὁμμασιν ἀνεζήτησα τὸ ἐπίσημον ἀγγλικὸν κείμενον ταύτης, ἀλλ' οὐδαμοῦ ἐν Ἀθήναις τοῦτο ἀνεύρον! Χάριν ἐμοῦ, τὸ **British Council** κατὰ τὴν 18-12-1997 ἐνετόπισεν εἰς τὴν διεύθυνσιν <http://www.ifi.uio.no/~hennings/schengen/intro.html> μόνον μίαν *unofficial(?)*³ translation of the "CONVENTION from 19 June 1990 APPLYING THE SCHENGEN

³ The reason given being that, *official* translations exist only in the languages of the Governments having signed the Convention; and so far, the British Government, for its own reasons, has chosen not to sign the Convention.

AGREEMENT OF 14 JUNE 1985 BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE STATES OF THE BENELUX ECONOMIC UNION, THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY AND THE FRENCH REPUBLIC, ON THE GRADUAL ABOLITION OF CHECKS AT THEIR COMMON BORDERS".
 'Ανέγνωσα ταύτην μετὰ πάσης δυνατῆς προσοχῆς καὶ διαβεβαιῶ ὅτι οὐδεμίαν ἐν αὐτῇ ἀνεκάλυψα "ποινηρίαν" (κατὰ τὸ τῶν ἐν Ἑλλάδι ἐγκαλούντων αὐτὴν πνεῦμα)! Ἡ συνθήκη οὐδαμοῦ ἀπαιτεῖ ὅσα δῆθεν δόλια κατ' αὐτῆς δηλοῦντ' ἐν Ἑλλάδι! Μᾶλλον, περιορίζει τὰς πιθανὰς τε καὶ ἀπιθάνους ἀπαιτήσεις συλλογῆς, χρήσεως καὶ τηρήσεως (ἐν τῷ πνεύματι αὐτῆς καὶ διὰ τὰς ἀνάγκας αὐτῆς) καὶ διακινήσεως (μεταξὺ τῶν συμβαλλομένων χωρῶν) προσωπικῶν πληροφοριῶν, καὶ οὐδαμοῦ τίθησι τὰς ὑφ' ἑαυτὴν δραστηριότητας πέραν ἢ ὑπεράνω τῶν δικαστικῶν ἀρχῶν τῶν συμβαλλομένων χωρῶν, αἵτινες ἀναλαμβάνουσι τὴν πλήρη εὐθύνην τηρήσεως τῶν παρ' αὐτῶν παρεχομένων τοιούτων πληροφοριῶν ἐν τῷ καθαρῳτάτῳ πνεύματι τῆς συνθήκης!

Ἐπὶ πλέον: (α) Τὸ ἄρθρον 126.1 δηλοῖ ὅτι: With regard to the automatic processing of personal data *transmitted pursuant to this Convention* [emphasis added] each Contracting Party shall, no later than the time of entry into force of this Convention, adopt the national provisions required to achieve a level of protection of personal data *at least equal* [emphasis added] to that resulting from the principles of the Council of Europe Convention of 28 January 1981 for the protection of individuals with regard to automatic processing of personal data. Συνεπῶς, ἡ συνθήκη ἀναζητεῖ ἐλέγχειν *μόνον τὰς μεταξὺ χωρῶν καὶ τῷ αὐτῆς πνεύματι διακινουμένας* περὶ προσώπων πληροφορίας! Οὐκ ὅμως ἐπιβάλλει ὁμοίους ἢ τινὰς ἐτέρους περιορισμοὺς περὶ τὴν φύσιν καὶ χρῆσιν προσωπικῶν δεδομένων συλλεγομένων ὑπὸ τῶν καθέκαστα κυβερνήσεων διὰ τοὺς *ἐσωτερικοὺς σκοποὺς* τῶν χωρῶν αὐτῶν! Πᾶς ἄρα συλλογὴ τε καὶ *χρήσις* προσωπικῶν στοιχείων, *οὐσιωδῶς σχετικῶν πρὸς πέραν τῶν ὑπὸ τῆς συνθήκης (ἐν τοῖς ἄρθροις 40 καὶ 41) σαφέστατα ὀριζομένων παραβάσεων* (assassination, murder, rape, arson, counterfeiting, armed robbery and receiving of stolen goods, extortion, kidnapping and hostage taking, traffic in human beings, illicit traffic in narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances, breach of the laws on arms and explosives, use of explosives, illicit carriage of toxic and dangerous waste, and taking to flight after an accident which has resulted in death or serious injury), οὐ διατάσσεται ὑπὸ τῆς συνθήκης, καὶ *μόνον κατὰ κακόπιστον φαντασίαν, ἢ κακόβουλον ἀπιστίαν, ἢ σκόπιμον ἀτιμίαν* δύνατ' ἐμφανίζεσθαι, *παρ' οἵουδήποτε*, ὡς ὑπὸ τῆς συνθήκης ἐπιβαλλομένη!⁴

(β) Τὸ ἄρθρον 134 δηλοῖ ὅτι: The provisions of this Convention shall apply only insofar as they are compatible with [European] Community law.

(γ) Τὸ ἄρθρον 135 δηλοῖ ὅτι: The provisions of this convention shall apply subject to the provisions of the Geneva Convention of 28 July 1951 relating to the Status of Refugees, as amended by the New York Protocol of 31 January 1967.

⁴ Τὰ ἐν τῇ παραγράφῳ αὐτῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ "Συνεπῶς..." ἕως τέλους αὐτῆς ἀναφερόμενα προσετέθησαν κατὰ τὸν παρόντα χρόνον, ἵνα πληρέστερον ἐξηγηθῇ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἄρθρου 126.1 τῆς Συνθήκης τοῦ Schengen.

Συνεπώς, *πάσα τῆς συνθήκης αὐτῆς στρέβλωσις, καὶ πάσα πρὸς τὸ πνεῦμ' αὐτῆς ἀπάδουσα παρουσιάσις* τοῦ σκοποῦ καὶ περιεχομένου αὐτῆς, ὡς καὶ *πᾶς ἀντίθετος πρὸς τὸ πνεῦμ' αὐτῆς χρῆσις αὐτῆς, μόνον* δολία δύναται εἶναι, καὶ σκοποῦσα εἰς *συγκάλυψιν ἐγκληματιῶν τε καὶ τῶν ἐγκλημάτων αὐτῶν!*

Ἄλλ' ἐὰν καὶ περὶ τούτων νῦν ἐρωτήσωμεν·

(α) *τίς* τῶν βαλλόντων κατὰ τῆς συνθήκης ἐπιτρέπει τὴν κακοποιῶν ἀνεξέλεγκτον εἴσοδον ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ;

(β) *πῶς* ἀντιχριστιανικὴ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀπαγόρευσις αὕτη, ἡ ἔλλειψιν ἀγάπης δηλοῦσα;

(γ) ἔστι *χριστιανικὸν* τὸ κακοποιεῖν "ἀγαπᾶν" ὑπὲρ ἑαυτόν, γυναῖκα, τέκνα, ἐστίας, βωμοὺς λατρείας Θεοῦ, ἢ τάφους προγόνων;

(δ) *τίνι* δικαίωμαθ' ἡμεῖς, οἱ *μόνοι χάριν τῶν ἰδίων ἀνομιῶν τὴν ἀστυνομίαν οὐσία κατηγορηκότες*, ἀπαιτοῦμεν παρ' ἄλλων ὁμοίως ποιεῖν πρὸς ἡμᾶς;

(ε) *τίς* αὐτῶν ἐπίεσε τὴν Ἑλλάδα τὰς συνθήκας αὐτῶν ἀποδέξασθαι;

(ς) *πῶς* ἐὰν ἐκτὸς τοῦ λοιποῦ κόσμου διὰ τὴν *στρεβλὴν* ἡμῶν τῶν πραγμάτων ἀντίληψιν βουλώμεθα παραμένειν, τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀεὶ αἰτιώμεθα;

(ζ) *πῶς* ἀφ' ἡμῶν διαφεύγει ὅτι ὡς *εἷς ἐν ἑξακοσίοις* ἔναντι τοῦ λοιποῦ κόσμου ἰστάμενοι, οὐδόλως ἔχομεν τάλαθρον *ἄνευ παντάπασι Λογικῆς ἀποδείξεως*;

Τί οὖν συναγαγεῖν δεῖ ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ πάντων τούτων ὁμοῦ; Τί ἄλλο πλὴν ὅτι ἡ δῆθεν "πεπαιδευμένων" ἀνθρώπων διὰ μακρῶν καὶ βραχέων περὶ τῆς συνθήκης "συζήτησις" ἄνευ μελέτης τοῦ κειμένου αὐτῆς ἀποκρίσεως τοῖς ὡς ἂν ἐν αὐτῇ συναφέσιν ἐρωτήμασιν ἐστὶν ἐντελὴς ἀσυγχώρητος καὶ καταδηλοῖ τὸ τούτων ὅλως ἀπαίδευτον; Ἐὰν δ' ἡ ἀποφυγὴ τῆς μελέτης τοῦ κειμένου αὐτῆς ἢ σκόπιμος, ἵνα παράσχη "ἄλλοθι" τι τοῖς κατ' αὐτῆς βάλλουσι, τότε ἐπιπροσθέτως, ἡ πρᾶξις αὕτη ἐστὶ κακοθηεστέρα, ἱκανότατα καταδεικνύσα τὸ σατανικώτατον τῶν μετερχομένων αὐτῆς! Ἐν προκειμένῳ, ἐννοῶ ἐξαντλῆσαι τὰ περιθώρια Λογικῆς αὐστηρότητος! Διότι διὰ τῶν ἀκκισμῶν κάπρπειῶν τῶν δολίως καὶ κατὰ τῆς συνθήκης ταύτης βαλλόντων πλὴν ὡς "προβάτων" μεταξὺ ἡμῶν διαγόντων [μὴ δὲ καὶ διεθνεῖς κακοποιοὶ κρύπτονται ὑπὸ ῥάσα, ἐν ναοῖς καὶ μοναῖς; μὴ δ' οὐ παγκοσμίως γεγόναμεν καταγέλαστοι διὰ τὸ ἐπιμεῖναι ὑποστηρίζειν τοὺς ἐν Γιουγκοσλαβίᾳ δῆθεν "Ὀρθοδόξους" ἐγκληματίας;⁵ μὴ διὰ μόνον τὸν φόβον ἀπωλείας τῶν μέχρι τοῦδ' ὑπ' αὐτοὺς ἀμαθῶν δεσμίων "ποιμνίων", οἱ δι' ἀδρανείας τῆς διανοίας αὐτῶν ἀπολέσαντες τὴν ἑαυτῶν Ὀρθὴν ἐπὶ Θεῷ πίστιν "Ὀρθόδοξοι Θεολόγοι ποιμένες" ἡμῶν ἐννοοῦσιν ἐπιμένειν ἐπὶ τὸ κατασυκοφαντεῖν πάντας τοὺς μὴ κατ' αὐτοὺς "Ὀρθοδόξους", ἀνεξαρτήτως Ἀληθείας, ἢ Λόγου, ἢ τιμότητος;] διακυβεύεται αὕτη ἡ σοβαρότης, ὑπόληψις καὶ τιμὴ τῶν ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἔτι ὑπολειπομένων Ἑλλήνων καὶ Χριστιανῶν τῶν ἀληθῶς φοβουμένων Θεόν! Ἐπὶ τέλους, οὐ πάντες οἱ ἐκτὸς Ἑλλάδος ἢ τῆς τοιαύτης "Ὀρθοδοξίας" εἰσὶν ἀθεόφοβοι, ἄδικοι, ἄτιμοι, δόλιοι, ἀνόητοι, ἢ ἡλίθιοι! Καὶ μόν' οἱ ἐντὸς ἀμφοτέρων οἱ Θεοῦ ἐκλεκτοὶ! Τοσοῦτον ἀπώλετο νῦν ἡ περὶ Ὑβρεως καὶ Αἰδοῦς Ὁραία Ἑλληνικὴ Αἴσθησις!;

⁵ Σημειώσατε ὅτι ταῦτα ἐγράφησαν ἐν ὁλόκληρον ἔτος πρὸ τοῦ ἐν Κοσσυφοπεδίου πολέμου τοῦ 1999!

Ἐπὶ τέλους, ἐφ' ἡμῶν νῦν ἐστὶν ὁ καιρὸς ὅτε πάντες οἱ ἄνευ τῆς τοιαύτης Αἰσθήσεως "από το γυαλί" ὁμιλοῦντες καὶ ἕως περάτων κτιστοῦ σύμπαντος διὰ τῶν ἠλεκτρομαγνητικῶν κυμάτων διαχέοντες βλασφημίας, φοβερὰ καθ' ἡμῶν δεινῶς μαρτυρούσας, ὀφείλουσιν ἐγκλεῖσ' ἑαυτοὺς εἰς τὰ ταμεῖα αὐτῶν ἵν' ἀναλογισθῶσι τὴν ἰδίαν γυμνότητα! Κἂν ἔτι μετὰ τοῦτο ἐπιθυμῶσιν ἐπανελθεῖν εἰς οἶονδῆποτε δημόσιον βῆμα, ὅπως κοσμίως ἐνδύσῃ ταύτην· σήμερον εὕρισκομένην εἰς τὸ κέντρον τῆς τοῦ τόπου τούτου εἰκόνας, τῆς ὅλως οἰκτρᾶς καὶ προσβλητικῆς τοῦ παγκοσμίου Πολιτισμοῦ!

Γ. ΠΕΡΙ ΤΑΣ ΝΕΑΣ ΤΑΥΤΟΤΗΤΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΑ ΣΥΝΑΦΗ

Ὡς ἄκρως ἐπικριτικὸς ἦν ἐν τοῖς ὡς ἄνω τῶν ἐκ δῆθεν θρησκευτικῆς παρορμήσεως δρώντων, ἐπιτρέψατέ μοι παρουσιάσαι νῦν καὶ τὴν ἑτέραν καὶ τὴν ὅλην τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐνὸς νομίσματος ὄψιν:

Η ΤΗΣ ΥΣΤΕΡΗΣΕΩΣ ΤΗΣ ΧΩΡΑΣ ΚΥΡΙΑ ΑΙΤΙΑ

Ἡ ἐν πολλοῖς τρομακτικῇ τῆς χώρας ὑστέρησις ὀφείλετ' ἐς σύμπασαν τὴν πνευματικὴν τῆς χώρας κοινότητα, οὐ δ' εἰς μόνην τὴν δῆθεν Ὁρθόδοξον θρησκευτικὴν ταύτης ποιότητα! Ὅπερ ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ ταύτῃ ἐλλείπει ἀπ' αἰώνων μακρῶν ἐστὶν ἡ καλόπιστος ἀνάλυσις τῶν πνευματικῶν προβλημάτων, καὶ ἡ ταπεινόφρων ὁμολογία τῆς ἀρρήκτου αὐτῶν συναφείας πρὸς τὰ πρακτικὰ πράγματα! Αὐτὸς ὁ Σωκράτης κατεδικάσθη ὅτ' ἐν τῷ Δήμῳ κατανοητὸν ἐγγέγονει ὅτι ἡ διαλεκτικὴ αὐτοῦ περὶ Ἀρετῆς καὶ Δικαιοσύνης, ἔτι διδασκομένη, εἶχεν ἐφαρμογὴν ἄμεσον οὐκ εἰς μόνον τὰ θεωρητικὰ φιλοσοφικὰ ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ καθημερινὰ πρακτικὰ δημόσια πράγματα! Ἐπιστρέφοντες οἴκαδ' οἱ μαθηταὶ ἡρώτων τοὺς πατέρας αὐτῶν καὶ πρεσβυτέρους τῶν πολιτῶν τὸ δεινὸν τοῦτο· "τί σὺ ἐν καιρῷ πολέμου ἐποίησας;" Εἵκοσι καὶ ἑπτὰ ἔτη ὁ πόλεμος ἐκεῖνος διήρκεσε! Μεθ' ὅλην πενταετίαν ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτοῦ λήξεως, ὅτ' ἐν τῷ Δήμῳ κατεχωνεύθη τίνες ποτ' ἦσαν καὶ πόθεν ἐξέπεσαν, προσήχθη ὁ Σωκράτης εἰς δίκην! Ὁ Δήμος ἄρ' οὖν ἐπέζητησεν ὅπως διὰ τῆς καταδίκης τοῦ τολμήσαντος ὑπαινίξασθαι τὴν ὁδὸν ἐρεῦνης τῶν πεπραγμένων κατασιγᾶσι τὸν δημόσιον αὐτῶν ἔλεγχον, εἰς ὃν, διὰ τοῦ πολιτεύματος τῆς δημοκρατίας, ἀρρήκτως ὑπεύθυνός τε καὶ ἔνοχός ἐστι πᾶς πολίτης! Ὅτ' ἀλλήλους δῆμος τε καὶ δημαγωγοὶ διαφθείρουσι, καὶ οἱ δεῦτεροι, ἵν' ἀποφύγῃσι τᾶκρως αὐτοῖς πρώτοις δυσάρεστα, τὸν πρώτον εἰς παραλογισμοὺς ἄγουσιν, ὁ μὲν πρῶτος τοὺς ἡγέτας ἐπερωτᾷ, κείνοι δ' ἀνταπαντῶσι "τί πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καθ' ἃ ἡμᾶς διετάξατε οὕτω καὶ πεποιήκαμεν!", τῆς περὶ τὰ πεπραγμένα εὐθύνης, ὡς σφαίρας παιδιᾶς μεταξὺ τῶν δύο οὕτως αἰεὶ πετομένης, ἀπολλυμένης! Ἀλλὰ ποῖον τῶν μερῶν ἄρα τιμᾷ ἡ παιδιὰ αὕτη; Πῶς ὁ ἀπαιδευτὸς δῆμος τιμᾶται; Διὰ τῶν κολακειῶν τῶν δημαγωγῶν; Οἱ δ' ἡγέται πῶς ἄρα τιμῶνται ἡγούμενοι ἀπαιδευτῶν; Πῶς δὲ λέγεται ὅτι "προσβολή" ἢ ἐρώτησις αὕτη ἐστίν, ὅτ' ἀμφοτέρων ἐκείνων ἐπὶ σκοπῷ βελτιώσεως τοῦ κοινοῦ αὐτῶν βίου καλουμένων ἐπιδείξει, διὰ τοῦ ἐνδελεχοῦς τῶν πεπραγμένων ἐλέγχου, τὴν ἀληθῆ παιδείαν τῆς πόλεως, αὐ-

τοὶ εἰς τὴν αἰσχροὴν ταύτην παιδιὰν περισσῶς μέχρις ἐξαντλήσεως ἐπιδίδονται, ἕως τέλους οὐδὲν διδασκόμενοι; Τιμᾷ ἄρα τοὺς Ἕλληνας ὅτι οὕτως ἐξαντληθέντες παρέδωκαν ἑαυτοὺς τυράννοις τε καὶ αὐτοκράτορσιν τε καὶ ἱεράρχαις κατὰ τὰ παλαιότατα ἀνατολικά ἤθη ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἄρχουσι, δῆθεν θεόθεν ἔχουσι πᾶν ἐπὶ κείνους δικαίωμα, καθ' ὧν οὐδέποτε ἐπὶ μακροτάτους αἰῶνας ἑλληνικῶς ἐξηγέθησαν, μεθ' ὧν μέχρι καὶ τῆσδε στιγμῆς παίζουσι τὴν ἔθνικὴν αὐτὴν παιδιάν, οὐδενὸς αὐτῶν κατασχυνομένου;

Οὐτε οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι οὐτε οἱ λοιποὶ Ἕλληνες ἐδιδάχθησάν ποτέ τι ἀπὸ τοῦ πολέμου ἐκείνου! Καὶ συνήχισαν *ἀδιάκοπον* τὸν ἐμφύλιον σπαραγμόν! Καὶ παρήλθον οἱ χρόνοι, μᾶλλον καὶ μᾶλλον ἀδυνατωτέρους καταλιπόντες αὐτούς! Καὶ ὅθ' ἠρέθησαν ὑπὸ τοὺς Φίλιππον καὶ Ἀλέξανδρον, *ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐκ βάθρων ἀνοικοδομῆσαι τὴν πολιτικὴν τῆς ὅλης ἡνωμένης χώρας δομὴν*, ἵν' ἐπὶ τέλους ἐπιδοθῶσιν εἰς τὰ πρὸ αὐτῶν κείμενα λύσιν ἀναζητοῦντα μεγάλα τ' ἀνθρώπου προβλήματα καὶ ταῦτοῖς συναφῇ παρ' αὐτῶν μὴ ἔτι γεγενημένα, οὐτ' ἀναληφθέντα, οὐτε παραδοθέντα μεγάλα ἔργα εἰρήνης καὶ εὐτυχίας τοῦ τόπου, οὗτοι κατὰ τῶν Περσῶν ἐξεστράτευσαν καὶ εἴτα πάλιν ἐν ἀδελφῶν σπαραγμοῖς ἐδήλωσαν τὴν τοῦ ἔθνους ἀλκὴν! Καὶ περιήλθον μετὰ ὑπὸ ξένους τυράννους, δυτικούς τε κἀνατολικούς! Ἀπολέσαντες τὸ ἴδιον φῶς, ἐπ' αἰῶνας μακροὺς περιδέρονται μεταξὺ δύσεως τε κἀνατολῆς ὡς Ἰανοὶ ἀναζητοῦντες ἐκεῖ καὶ ἐκεῖ ὡς φωστῆρας τοὺς σωτῆρας αὐτῶν ἀνατέλειν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκατέρωθεν εὐρέων θαλασσινῶν ὀριζόντων! Ὅτι οὐδέποτε κατενόησαν ὅτι *αἰ γηγενεῖς* οἱ σωτῆρες οἱ γνήσιοι! Ὅτι ὅτ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἰδέαι ξέναι εἰσάγονται, οὐδέποτε ἀκατέργαστοι, ἄνευ ἐπὶ μόνα τὰ βελτίω προσαρμογῆς ἢ συντήξεως τῷδε νῶ καὶ τῷδε χῶ καὶ τῷδε ἰδρώτι δύνανται ἀναφύεσθ' ἐς θαλερὰ εὐοσμ' ἄνθη! Ὅτι ἀπολέσαντες τὸ *ἐσώτερον αὐτῶν* ἑλληνικὸν φῶς, τὸ ὃν καὶ πυξίδα πορείας ἐπὶ τὰ ὑψιπετὴ πρόσω, ἐλησμόνησαν ὅτι *οὐ διὰ κεινῶν λόγων ἀλλὰ διὰ κόπων* ἐγείρονται Παρθενῶνες! Καὶ ἀπέμειναν ἀτενίζοντες τὰ ἐρείπια, παρ' ὧν ἔτι τρέφονται, ἅπερ εὐκαιρίας δοθείσης ἀντὶ δηναρίων ἔτι πωλοῦσι τοῖς ξένοις! Ἀεὶ δημαγωγοί, *ἄνευ* τινὸς *πρακτικῆς* φαντασίας, ἢ τινος καταγνώσεως τοῦ πῶς νοηταὶ θεωραὶ συντελοῦνται τῇ πράξει καὶ ἔργ' ἀπτὰ γίνονται, ἀενάως κατατριβόμενοι διὰ τοῦτο εἰς λόγους *κεινούς*, ἵνα μήποτε καταφανῇ ἡ πλήρης περὶ τὰ πρακτικὰ ἀνικανότης αὐτῶν, ὁρῶντες οὐδὲν πέραν τοῦ τῆς ρίνος αὐτῶν ἐγωισμοῦ, ἀγαγόντες τὸν δῆμον ἀφ' ἡσσόνων δεινῶν εἰς δεινὰ μείζονα, ἀνακηρύσσοντ' εἰς μεγάλους ἄνδρας τοῦτου τοῦ ἔθνους· ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ ὑπὸ τὴν ἡγεσίαν ἐκείνων δοκοῦντος διασκεδαστικὸν θέατρον εἶναι τὴν δημοσίαν ζωὴν, ἐν ᾗ συμφύρονται οἱ *πάσης ποιότητος* καὶ *κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτῶν* *πλήθος* *κακοὶ πολιτικοὶ, θεατρικοὶ καὶ λοιποὶ πάντες* *θεατρικῶς* *πλὴν αἰσχροῦς φερόμενοι* *δημόσιοι ἄνδρες*! Ὁ δῆμος ἐπαινεῖ! Οὐδέποτε ἐν ἐσόπτρῳ ἑαυτὸν καθορᾷ! Κουδέποτε διὰ τὸ θέαμα, ὅπερ καὶ καθορᾷ, καταλαμβάνεται ὑπ' ὀργῆς!

Ἡ *πολιτικὴ* ἱστορία τοῦ τόπου ὠδήγησεν ἡμᾶς ὧδε. Οὐδέποτε μετὰ τὴν ὑποταγὴν "ἐλέω Θεοῦ" βασιλεῦσιν ἀπεκτήσαμεν ποθ' *ἡμετέραν* *τινὰ Magna Carta*, ὡς οἱ Δυτικοὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ 1215 ἤρξαντο ἔχειν, δι' ἧς *εἰλικρινῶς* *ἀνεγνωρίσθη* *ποτέ* *τῷ ἡμετέρῳ* *λαῷ*, *ἐνὶ ἐκάστῳ ἀνθρώπῳ*, καὶ δι' ἧς *εἰλικρινῶς*

ὁμολογήθη ποτέ παρὰ τοῦ ἡμετέρου λαοῦ, παρ' ἐνὸς ἐκάστου ἀνθρώπου, κυριαρχικὰ πολιτικὰ ἀλληλεγγύως δεσμευτικὰ δικαιώματα ἐπ' αὐτῇ τῇ προσωπικῇ τιμῇ ἢ ἀτιμώσει ἐκάστου συμβαλλομένου ἀρχομένου καὶ ἄρχοντος, οὐδέποτ' ἐν αὐθαιρεσίᾳ ἐρχόμενα, ἀλλ' αἰετὶ μετὰ τῶν ἀναποσπάστως αὐτοῖς συνακολουθῶν δεσμεύσεων, ἠθικῶν τε καὶ Λογικῶν, τῆς κυριότητος! Πάντα τοιαῦθ' ἃ νῦν ἔχομεν, ἐξ Ἑσπερίας ἐστὶν εἰσηγμένα, καὶ ἔτι δι' ἄγνωσαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ σκοπίμως καὶ ἐπιπολαίως παραποιεῖται κατὰ τὴν εἰσαγωγὴν ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπὶ σκοπῷ παντοειδῶς ἰδιοτελοῦς αὐτῶν κέρδους εἰσαγόντων αὐτά! Ὁ λαὸς οὐδέποτ' ἐπαιδεύθη περὶ τὰς λεπτομερείας (ἀνάγκας, σκοπούς, δεσμεύσεις, τρόπον πρωτογενοῦς κτήσεως, τρόπον καθημερινῆς λειτουργίας, ἐγγυήσεις, ἐλέγχους, ἐπαίνους, ποινὰς ἢ καὶ ἐκπτώσεις ἀπὸ) τάλῃθως συγχρόνου δημοκρατικοῦ πολιτεύματος! Ἀδιαψεύστως ἡ μέχρι τοῦδε τοῦ ἡμετέρου πολιτεύματος λειτουργία μαρτυρεῖ τάλῃθως τῆς δηλώσεως ταύτης, ὅσονδ' ἴσως καὶ αὕτη οὐκ ἀρεστὴ ἢ ἡμῖν πᾶσιν! Ἡ ἀπὸ τῆς παλιγγενεσίας προσπάθεια τῶν ὀπλαρχηγῶν μεταφορᾶς εἰς αὐτοὺς τῶν ὠφελιμάτων τῶν πρὸ αὐτῆς (οὐ τοπικῶν μόνον) Τούρκων ἀρχόντων (υἱοθετησάντων τὴν βυζαντινὴν πρακτικὴν) καὶ πᾶσα ἡ μετέπειτ' ἐξέλιξις τῶν σχέσεων κράτους καὶ "πολίτου", ὑπηκόου (*subject under royal or quasi-royal authority*) μέχρι τοῦ νῦν λεγομένου, ὑφισταμένου ἀνήκεστον καθ' ἡμέραν τλαιπωρίαν ὑπὸ τῶν δημοσίων ὑπηρετῶν ἀταναγορευομένων εἰς "ἐξουσίαν", σκοπίμως καὶ μετὰ παγερᾶς ἀπροθυμίας, χάριν τῆς ἰδίας αὐτῶν ἰσχυρότητος καὶ τῆς εἰς βάρος αὐτοῦ ὠφελείας τοῦ ὅλου "συστήματος ἐξουσίας", δῆθεν "ὑπηρετούντων" αὐτὸν διὰ τῆς ὅλης κρατικῆς ὁργανώσεως, εἴτ' ἐν ταῖς ἀναριθμήτοις δημοσίαις ὑπηρεσίαις, εἴτ' ἐν σχολείοις τε καὶ νοσοκομείοις, εἴτ' ἔτι ἐν τοῖς δικαστηρίοις τῆς χώρας αὐτοῦ⁶, τοῦ ὅλου "συστήματος" ἀναντιρρήτως ἔσθωθεν ἔξωσε διαχέοντος βαρεῖαν τὴν ὁσμὴν τῆς ἐγκαταλείψεως, σήψεως, παρακμῆς, ἀδιαφορίας, ὑπηρετῶν καὶ ὑπηρετουμένων, αὕτη τουτέστιν πᾶσα ἡ λειτουργία τοῦ κράτους τῶν Ἑλλήνων δημοκρατικῶν πολιτῶν, οὐδενὸς αὐτῶν ἀναγνωρίζοντος τὰς ἑαυτοῦ τιμητικὰς ἰδίας υποχρεώσεις, καταμαρτυρεῖ τὴν δεινὴν τῆς χώρας ὑστέρησιν· νῦν κομπαζούσης ἀκρίτως διὰ τὴν ἑαυτῆς χαριστικὴν εἴσοδον εἰς τὴν χορείαν τῶν προηγμένων τοῦ κόσμου χωρῶν ὧν οὐδεμία ἀπατάται, ὡς οὐδενὸς αὐτῶν αἰσθανομένου τὸ μέγα πρὸ ἐνὸς ἐκάστου ἡμῶν κείμενον ἀπαιτούμενον ἔργον, δι' οὗ μόνου συντετελεσμένου ἐσομένου πρῶτον ἐν νοῖς, ψυχαῖς καὶ καρδίαις, καὶ εἶτα ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ τόπῳ ἡμῶν, ἀναγνωρισθῆσεται ἡ μετὰ κείνων ἰσοτιμία!

⁶ [ἐν οἷς καὶ διὰ μόνης τῆς ὁφείσεως τῆς ὅλης λειτουργίας αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς ἐφ' ἑδρας ἐνδυμασίας τῶν δικαστῶν διακυβεύεται συνεχῶς ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πολιτεύματος· ἐν οἷς κατὰ τὰς τελευταίας ταύτας ἡμέρας κατερρακώθη αὐτὸ κατὰ τὴν δίκην πρώην ὑπουργοῦ Δικαιοσύνης κατὰ δημοσιογράφου διὰ τῶν ἀπαραδέκτων θορυβωδῶν ἀσεβῶν διαξιφισμῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν δικαστῶν πάντων ὁμιλούντων ὁμοῦ κατ' ἀλλήλων, τῶν δικαστῶν καὶ τῶν κλητῶν ἐμφανῶς ἀδυνατούντων ἐπιβαλεῖν τὴν τάξιν ἐν ἀκαρεῖ· ὅπου ὁ πολίτης μᾶλλον καλεῖτ' ἀποδείξει τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀθωότητα ἢ ὑποστηῖν τὴν συνέπειαν τῆς ἀποδείξεως, ἂν αὕτη παρασχεθῇ, τῆς κατ' αὐτοῦ καταγγελίας (τοῦ κατηγοροῦ-εἰσαγγελέως καθημένου, πρὸς τὴν πολιτῶν τρομοκράτησιν μάλλον ἢ τὸν τούτων εὐγενῆ σεβασμὸν τοῦ δικαστηρίου, οὐχὶ εἰς ἴσην πρὸς τὴν αὐτοῦ τράπεζαν, ἀμφοτέρων πρὸ τῆς δικαστικῆς ἑδρας, ἀλλ' εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν ὑψηλὴν τῶν δικαστῶν ἑδραν, καὶ ἄρα οὐχὶ ἴσως πρὸς αὐτὸν δικαζομένου διὰ τὴν ἀμεμπτον ἀρτιότητα τῆς κατὰ τοῦ πολίτου κατηγορίας)].

Ἐντὶ φεῦ τούτων "καλλιεργεῖται" παρ' ἡμῖν ἀρνούμενοις καταβαλεῖν τὸν κόπον τοῦ ἔργου ἢ δῆθεν καθαγιαστικὴ τῆς δεινῆς ἱστορικῆς ἐπ' ἀμίλλῃ ἡμῶν ὑστερήσεως ἰδέα τῆς ἡμετέρας "ἰδιαιτερότητος"! Σήμερον, ἀνευρυθιάστως καὶ ἀσυναισθήτως ὀνομάζομεν "ἐθνικὴν ἰδιαιτερότητα" τὴν ἡμετέραν πείσμονα καὶ ἠθελημένην ὑστέρησιν προσπαθείας ἐπὶ τὰ ἄριστα! Καὶ ἐν τούτῳ, δοκοῦμεν ἑαυτοὺς καλοὺς πατριώτας!

Αἱ θεμελιώτικαι τοῦ μελλοντοῦ τῆς χώρας ἀναγκαι

Κατὰ Λόγον ἐξεταζόμενον, τὸ ὑπ' ἀνασύνταξιν Σύνταγμ' ἔστι διάτρητον ὑπὸ πλήθους λογικῶν ἀνακολουθιῶν! Σκοπῖμως, οὔτε οἱ συντάκται αὐτοῦ ἔλαβόν ποτ' εὐθείαν ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἐξουσίαν ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ, οὔτε ὁ σκοπὸς τῆς συντάξεως αὐτοῦ ἀναφέρονται! Ὁ δὲ τρόπος τῆς ἐπικυρώσεως αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ περιφρονητικῶς ἀγνοεῖται! [Παρὰ πάντα τὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ 1787 διδασχθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν συντακτῶν τοῦ παγκοσμίως πρώτου συντάγματος τῆς Ἀμερικανικῆς Συμπολιτείας!] Μόνον τὸ ὄνομα τῆς Λογικῆς (κἂν μὴ ὡς τοιαύτης ὁμολογουμένης) Ἀγίας καὶ Ὁμοουσίου καὶ Ἀδιαιρέτου Τριάδος τυγχάνει ἐπικλήσεως ἐν κεφαλίδι! Ἐπικλήσεως ἀορίστου κἀναιτιολογήτου! Πλὴν ὡς ἐὰν οὕτω χαλαρῶς, σιωπηρῶς ἀπ' Αὐτῆς ἐκπορεύηται τὸ κάτωθεν Αὐτῆς κείμενον! Ὡς ἐὰν πάντα ταῦτ' ἀθῶως διέφυγον ἀπὸ τῶν δῆθεν σοφῶν αὐτοῦ συντακτῶν! Ἀθῶως; Τάχ' ἂν γ' ἴσως ὀψόμεθα! Οὐκ ἀθῶως; Ἄρ' ἐπ' ἀνομολογήτῳ σκοπῷ, πασῶν τῶν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ ταύτῃ λειτουργουσῶν ἡγεσιῶν καὶ ἐξουσιῶν! Ἐν αὐτῷ γε τῷ τῆς χώρας συντάγματι! Ἀλλὰ τότε πρὸς τί ἐκπληροσώμεθ' ὀρώντες τὴν σημερινὴν τῆς χώρας κατάληξιν; Οὐ λέγω ταῦτα ἵνα χωρήσωμεν εἰς ἀπαλοιφὴν τῆς ἀναφορᾶς εἰς τὴν Ἀγίαν Τριάδα! Ἄλλ' ἵνα συνετισθῶμεν!⁷ Καὶ χωρεῖ ἀμέσως μετὰ τὴν ἐπ' αὐτὸ κεφαλίδα τὸ ὑπ' ἀνασύνταξιν σύνταγμ' εἰς τὸ δηλοῦν ὅτι "τὸ πολίτευμα τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐστὶ ..."! Ὁμοίως καὶ τὰ παλαιότερα τούτου τῆς χώρας συντάγματα, ἀφ' ὧν ἐλήφθη ὁ τύπος οὗτος αὐτοῦ, ἐδήλουν ὅτι "τὸ πολίτευμα τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἦν ...", πλὴν διάφορον τοῦ παρόντος! Πῶς οὖν ἄρα ἡ αἰὲς αὐτῇ μία, Λογικὴ Ἀγία Τριάς ὀρίζει (σιωπηρῶς ἔστω) ὅπως τὸ τῆς αὐτῆς μιᾶς χώρας πολίτευμα ἧ ἐκάστοτε διάφορον καὶ οὐχὶ ἀμεταβλήτως τὸ αὐτὸ ἐν ἑσσεῖ,

⁷ Ἀρκεῖ πλέον ἢ μεγίστη ζημία ἢ ἤδη ἐπιγεγεννημένη τῇ χώρᾳ ὑπὸ τῶν ποικίλων αὐτονομαζομένων "ἀναρχικῶν", πασῶν τῶν πολιτικῶν παρατάξεων ἰδίᾳ δὲ τῆς Ἀριστερᾶς, τῶν μετὰ θρασυτάτης βουλμίας ἐπιδιωκόντων κατάρχειν ἐπ' ὀνόματ' αὐτῆς ταύτης δῆθεν τῆς ἀναρχίας, φιλτάτης αὐτοῖς οὔσης ὡς δῆθεν ἐχούσης φιλοσοφικὴν ἔδρασιν! Τί γάρ δοκοῦσιν; Ὅτι ἔσεται τις παγκοίνως ἐν ψυχαῖς σεβαστὸς καταστατικὸς νόμος μὴ ἔχων ἀναφορὰν εἰς τὴν Πρώτην Ἀρχήν, ἀλλ' εἰς μόνην τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν γε τῶν ἀναρχικῶν βούλησιν; Πῶς οὖν ἄλλοι ἀναρχικοί, ἀντιφρονούντες αὐτοῖς, ἐμποδισθήσονται ἀπὸ τοῦ περιφρονεῖν τὸν νόμον αὐτῶν; Πῶς ἀναρχικῶς δῆθεν ἀπὸ φιλοσοφίας ὀρμώμεν' ἐπιδιώκουσι καὶ ἐπικαλοῦνται δικαιώματ' ἐπ' ἐξουσιῶν καὶ ἀρχῶν, μὴ ἀντιλαμβανόμεν' ὅτι εἰς πλήρη ἀναρχίαν ἄγουσιν ἀναγκαιῶς τὴν χώραν; Τοσοῦτον οὖν ἄρα μισοῦσιν αὐτήν; Ἀλλὰ πῶς θρασυτάτα τότε, δικαιώματ' ἐπ' αὐτῇ ἀπαιτοῦσι; Πῶς ἀπ' αὐτῶν διαφεύγει ὅτι μόνον ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἐξικνοῦνται τὰ δικαιώματα; Ἀπερ ἄλλως ὅλως ἐστὶ πρόσκαιρα, ἀφαιρούμεν' ὑπὸ μάλλον ἰσχυροτέρων; Τί δὲ δοκοῦσιν; Ὅτι ὅμοιος τοῖς αὐτῶν νόμοις ἐστὶν ὁ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἀκατάλυτος Λογικὸς φυσικὸς νόμος, ἐφ' οὗ ἐδραζόμενοι σκευωροῦσιν ἐπ' ἀναρχίαν; Τοιαύτη οὖν ἐστὶν ἡ βαθεῖα γνώσις αὐτῶν τῶν Λογικῶν φυσικῶν νόμων;

τοῦτο ἀπὸ τῶν δῆθεν εὐσεβῶν (ὡς ἐπικαλουμένων τὸ "Ἅγιον Ὄνομα) πολιτικῶν, νομικῶν καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἡμῶν ἡγετῶν διαφεύγει, παρ' ὅτι καθάπτεται αὐτῆς τῆς τελείας Λογικότητος τῆς αἰ μῖς Θείας ἐπιθυμίας! Προφανέστατα διότι οὗτοι μόνους τοὺς ἐαυτῶν σκοποὺς ἐξουσίας ἐπὶ τοῦ λαοῦ ἐν νῷ ἔχοντες, οὐδόλως ἐνδιαφέρονται περὶ τοῦ πῶς ὡς ἐπ' ἄριστ' ἐπὶ τοῦ Λόγου ἀκλονήτως θεμελιῶσαι τὸν τῆς χώρας πρώτιστον νόμον! Καὶ ἀσφαλῶς περισπᾷ ἀπὸ τῶν σκοπῶν αὐτῶν τούτων πᾶσα εἰς τὸν Θεὸν-Λόγον ἀναφορά! Διὰ τοῦτο οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν σημειοὶ οὐδὲ σπεύδει διορθοῦν τὰς λογικὰς τοῦ βασικοῦ τούτου νόμου ἀνακολουθίας (ὧν τὰ ἤδη ἀναφερθέντα ἀπλή ἀρχὴ αὐτῶν ἦν)! Μοιραίως, ἡ ἐπικειμένη μερικὴ μόνη ἀναθεώρησις μᾶλλον ἐτι περιπλέξει τὰ πράγματα!

Πῶς σύγχρονον κράτος ἐπιθυμοῦντες οἰκοδομεῖν ἐπαφιέμεθ' εἰς τοὺς κοινούς ἐπαγγελματίας τῆς καθ' ἡμέραν εὐτελεστάτης πολιτικῆς, ἐνδιαφερομένους μόνον περὶ τὸ πῶς δεῖ τὸ σύνταγμ' ἀναθεωρηθῆναι ἵν' ἀκοπώτερος ὁ πολιτικὸς αὐτῶν βίος αὔριον ᾗ, οὐχὶ δ' ἵνα κάλλιον ἢ τοῦ λαοῦ εὐτυχία ἀσφαλισθῇ, καὶ οὐκ ἀπαιτοῦμεν ὅπως τὸ σύνταγμ' ἀνασκευασθῇ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὑπ' ἀνεξαρτήτου ἀπὸ τῶν συνήθων πολιτικῶν συντακτικῆς ἐπὶ τοῦτο μόνον ἐθνοσυνελεύσεως, ἧς τὰ οὐ πλείονα τῶν εἴκοσι πέντε, ἢ ἔστω πεντήκοντ' ἀληθῶς οὐ κατὰ σύμβασιν σοφὰ μέλη Λογικῶς συμπαγῇ καὶ καθαρῶτατον συντάξουσιν τὸν θεμέλιον νόμον, ὀρίσουσιν ἀπολύτως ἀπ' ἀλλήλων κεχωρισμένας τὰς τρεῖς ἐξουσίας⁸ ὧν τὰ μέλη δεῖ ἐκλέγεσθαι κεχωρισμένως ὑπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ,⁹ καὶ ἀποκλείσουσιν ἐαυτοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ πολιτικοῦ ἡγέτας ἔσεσθαι αὔριον κατὰ παραλλαγὴν τῆς Σόλωνος παραδόσεως, τοῦτο μόνον ὑπὸ τῆς μακραίωνος πολιτικῆς "ὀξυδερκείας" τοῦ λαοῦ ἐξηγεῖται· ἀνεχθέντος, ἵν' ἀποφύγῃ τὰς ἀφεύκτους ἰδίαις ἐκάστου πολίτου εὐθύνας καὶ ἐπιτύχῃ πλεονεκτήματα διὰ τῆς φαύλου δημοσίας ζωῆς, ὅπως ἐξουσιάζεται κατὰ μὲν τὰ πολιτειακὰ ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων οὓς οὐκ ἐλέγχει κατὰ τὸ πλεῖστον ὁπίσθην αὐτοῦ ἐνεργοῦντας, κατὰ δὲ τὰ ἐκκλησιαστικὰ ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων δῆθεν ἀπει-

⁸ νομοθετικὴν, οὐσιαστικῶς νομοθετοῦσαν ὑπὸ τὸ σύνταγμα· ἐκτελεστικὴν, ἀποκλειστικῶς ἐκτελοῦσαν ὑπὸ τὸ σύνταγμα καὶ τοὺς νόμους· καὶ δικαστικὴν ὑποχρεωτικῶς δικάζουσαν κατὰ μόνον τὸ σύνταγμα καὶ τοὺς νόμους καὶ κειμένην εὐθέως ὑπὸ τὸν Πρόεδρον τῆς Δημοκρατίας, καταργουμένης τῆς θέσεως τοῦ νῦν ἐπ' αὐτῆς ὑπουργοῦ Δικαιοσύνης ὡς μέλους τῆς ἐκτελεστικῆς ἐξουσίας!

⁹ διὰ τὴν δικαστικὴν, ἀρχικῶς μόνον τὰ διὰ βίου μέλη τοῦ ὀλιγο(έννεα)μελοῦς ἀνωτάτου δικαστηρίου ἐκ κοινῶν πέραν πολιτικῶν σκοπιμοτήτων καταλόγου πεντήκοντα ὑποψηφίων (ἡλικίας ἄνω τῶν τεσσαράκοντα καὶ πέντε ἐτῶν) συντασσομένου ὑπὸ τοῦ νομικοῦ κόσμου βάσει τῆς ἀπολύτου προσωπικῆς ἀκεραιότητος τῶν ὑποψηφίων καὶ τοῦ καθ' ὅλα ἐπιτυχούς αὐτῶν ἀδεκάστου δικαστικοῦ ἔργου, τοῦ πλήρους βιογραφικοῦ αὐτῶν σημειώματος παρουσιαζομένου πρὸ τοῦ λαοῦ (καὶ τῆς θέσεως τινος τῶν ἐννέα μελῶν τελευτώντος, κατὰ μὲν τὴν πρώτην πενταετίαν πληρουμένης ὑπὸ τοῦ πρώτου ἐπιλαχόντος κατὰ σειρὰν σταυρῶν ἐκλογῆς, μετὰ δὲ τὴν πενταετίαν ὑπὸ τοῦ νομοθετικοῦ μόνον σώματος ἐκλέγοντος κατὰ 2/3 ἢ 3/4 πλειοψηφίαν, ἐκ καταλόγου δεκαπέντε ὑποψηφίων ὁμοίως ἀκεραίων καὶ διὰ τὸ ἔργον αὐτῶν ὡς ἄνω γνωστῶν ὑποβαλλομένου ἐπίσης πέραν πάσης πολιτικῆς σκοπιμότητος ὑπὸ τοῦ νομικοῦ κόσμου)· τῶν ἐννέα συνερχομένων εἰς σῶμα ἐχόντων τὸ τελεσίδικον τοῦ ὑποχρεωτικοῦ συνταγματικοῦ ἐλέγχου τῶν νομοθετικῶν καὶ ἐκτελεστικῶν πράξεων καὶ τῆς τυχόν κηρύξεως αὐτῶν ἀντισυνταγματικῶν, μεθ' ἣν αὐταὶ αὐτομάτως δι' αὐτῆς καταργοῦνται, ἐπ' αὐστηροτάτη ποινῇ τῆς διὰ παντὸς ἐκπτώσεως ἀπὸ θέσεως καὶ τοῦ δημοσίου βίου παντὸς ἀσεβοῦντος!

λούντων τὴν αἰώνιον αὐτοῦ καταδίκην διὰ τὴν εἰς αὐτοὺς ἀνυποταξίαν· τῆς ὑποταγῆς εἰς αὐτοὺς δηλουμένης διὰ τοῦ φιλεῖν τὴν χεῖρ' αὐτῶν [*περὶ ὃ οὐσίᾳ δινεῖται πᾶς θρησκευτικὸς πόλεμος*], κατὰ σαφεστάτην παράβασιν ὑπὸ τῶν τὴν χεῖρα τεινόντων τε καὶ φιλούντων τοῦ θελήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ!

Ο ΠΑΡΩΝ ΠΟΛΕΜΟΣ ΜΕΤΑΞΥ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣ

Αἱ δύο αὗτ' ἐξουσίαι, μέχρι τοῦδ' ἐν δῆθεν ἀγαστῇ μετ' ἀλλήλων συνεργασίᾳ ἐπιβαλλόμεν' ἐπὶ τοῦ λαοῦ, νῦν ἀπεφάσισαν διὰ τὸ ἴδιον ἐκάστης συμφέρον ἐν ἀνοικτῷ πλέον πολέμῳ βαλεῖν μετὰ περισσῆς ἐκδήλου κακίας ἢ μία κατὰ τῆς ἄλλης· ἐξουσιαστικῶς ἀπαιτοῦσαι παρ' ἐκάστου παρ' ἀμφοτέρων δηλούμενου ὡς "ἐλευθέρου" πολίτου ὅπως ἀπεμπολήσῃ τὴν ἰδίαν ἐλευθερίαν καὶ προσδιορίζῃ ἑαυτὸν κατ' αὐτὰς ἀμφοτέρας *ὑποχρεωτικῶς μόνον οὕτως ἢ οὕτως*, αὐθις καθιστᾶσαι αὐτόν, καὶ τὸν δῆθεν "κυρίαρχον λαόν" πάντα, πεδῖον, ὄπλον καὶ θῦμα καὶ τῆς νέας αὐτῆς μάχης περὶ "ταυτοτήτων"! Ὁ παραλογισμὸς ἀμφοτέρων τούτων τῶν ἀπαιτήσεων δηλὸς ἐστίν. Εὐφυνεστέρα κατὰ τὴν παροῦσαν μάχην ἢ Ἐκκλησία υἱοθέτησε τὴν προτέραν κυβερνητικὴν πρότασιν *προαιρετικῆς ἀναγραφῆς* τοῦ θρησκευματος εἰς τὰ δελτία ταυτότητος, καθ' ἣς αὕτη *ομοῦ μετὰ τῆς τότε πολιτειακῆς ἀντιπολιτεύσεως καὶ νῦν κυβερνήσεως* τότε ἀντετάχθη ὑποστηρίξασα τὴν *ὑποχρεωτικὴν ἀναγραφὴν* τοῦ θρησκευματος! Ἀντιθέτως, *πλήρως ἀντιστρέψασα* τὴν τότε θέσιν αὐτῆς ἢ παρούσα κυβέρνησις τάσσεται νῦν ὑπὲρ τῆς *ὑποχρεωτικῆς μὴ ἀναγραφῆς* τοῦ θρησκευματος! Μόνῃ ἢ παρούσα μείζων ἀντιπολίτευσις ἐμμένει εἰς τὴν προγενεστέραν αὐτῆς θέσιν, πλὴν κατὰ τρόπον μὴ πλήρως πείθοντα! Ὡς οὐδεὶς συγκινεῖται ὑπὸ τῆς *φιλοσοφικῶς ὅλως ἀνελικρινοῦς* στάσεως τῆς τε Πολιτείας καὶ Ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῆς *ἀπηγορευμένης δι' ἄνδρας ἐντίμους* ἀνακολουθίας! *Οὐδέποθ'* ὁμολογοῦσα πρότερον σφάλμα, *καιροσκοπικῶς* ἐκάστη αὐτῶν προτάσσουσα ἔωλ' ἐπιχειρήματα υἱοθετεῖ τὴν ἐκάστοτε παρ' αὐτῆς κρινομένην ὡς πλέον πρόσφορον τοῖς ἰδίους αὐτῆς συμφέρουσι πρότασιν, *ἀδιαφοροῦσα* περὶ τῶν δικαιωμάτων καὶ συμφερόντων ἐκάστου πολίτου!

Οὐδέποτ' *εἰλικρινῶς* ἀναγνωρίσασαι ταῦτεξούσιον τοῦ προσώπου-πολίτου ἀμφοτέρ' αἱ ἐξουσίαι θεωροῦσι τὸ δελτίον ταυτότητος *ἀστυνομικῶς βαλλόμενον ἐπ' αὐτοῦ κρατικὸν ἔγγραφον* (ἐπὶ τῶν ἐφ' οὗ ἐκάστης δικαιωμάτων αὐθις ἐρίζουσιν ἀσχημόνως), οὐχὶ κατὰ *Λόγον ὑποχρεωτικὴν μὲν* (κατὰ *τάμετάβλητα βιολογικὰ-φυσικὰ*), *ἐλευθέραν δέ* (κατὰ *τὰ μεταβαλλόμενα προσωπικά*) ἀλλὰ πάντοτ' ἀκριβῆ ἑαυτοῦ πιστοποιήσιν, ἐφ' ἣς τὸ πρόσωπον-πολίτης, αὕτη ἢ *ἀδιαίρετος καὶ προσωπικῶς κυρίαρχος* πιστοποιουμένη μονὰς τοῦ κοινωνικοῦ βίου (ἐφ' ἣς *μόνης* ἀμφοτέρ' ἢ τε Πολιτεία καὶ Ἐκκλησία ἐδράζονται, ἢ μὲν ὡς Ἐκκλησία τοῦ Δήμου, ἢ δ' ὡς Ἐκκλησία Πιστῶν) *κέκτῃται μείζον' ἀμφοτέρων τῶν ἐξουσιῶν* δικαιώματα, καθ' ὅτι αὕτη μόνῃ καὶ τῶν δύο μετέχει, αὕτη μόνῃ καὶ τὰς δύο πιστοποιεῖ, καὶ *συλλογικῶς* αὕτη μόνῃ τὰς δύο ὀρίζει! *Σφάλλουνσιν*, εἰ ἄλλα δοκοῦντες, οἱ τε τῆς Πολιτείας καὶ Ἐκκλησίας ἄρχοντας ἡμῶν ἑαυτοὺς θεωροῦντες! Καὶ γὰρ *ὑπηρετᾶται* εἰσί, καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον καὶ κατὰ τὸ θεῖον δικαίωμα!

Διὰ τὰ πόλλ' *ἀδικήματα* τῶν κατὰ Πολιτείαν ὑπηρετῶν κατὰ τοῦ προσ-

ώπου-πολίτου, οὗτος φεῦ ἔμαθεν ὑποπτεύεσθαι τὴν ἀστυνομίαν ὅτι κατ' αὐτοῦ, οὐχὶ δὲ πιστῶς ὑπὲρ τῆς προστασίας αὐτοῦ, ἐνεργεῖ! Καὶ διὰ τὰ σύγχρονον τοῖς παροῦσι καιροῖς τῶν κατ' Ἐκκλησίαν ὑπηρετῶν σαφῶς ἀδυνατούντων σοφῶς ὁδηγῆσαι ἡμᾶς διὰ τῶν παρόντων καιρῶν, οὓς αὐτὸς ὁ Θεὸς ἐπέτρεψεν ἐφ' ἡμῶν ἔρχεσθαι, ἀλλ' οὓς αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἀνέγνωσαν οὐδὲ κατενόησαν, ὥς πάντες ἐμάθομεν φεῦ δέχεσθαι τὰ τῆς ἐπὶ Θεῷ Πίστεως κατὰ "πίστιν", ἥτοι κατὰ τὴν ἐκάστου διαίσθησιν καὶ συναίσθημα, οὐ δὲ κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν' αἰὶ Λόγον· ὃν ἐπ' αἰῶνας οἱ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἀφρόνως κατελίπον εἰς τὰς χεῖρας ψευδοδιανοουμένων αἰσχροῦς εἰς ἀπλοῦν, καὶ νῦν ὅλως κενόν, "λόγον" ὑποβιβασάντων Αὐτόν· διὰ τῆς ἀφροσύνης αὐτῶν ταύτης, δι' ἧς καὶ μόνους ἐχθροὺς διαβλέπουσιν ὅπου καὶ φίλοι, καὶ φίλους ὅπου μόνον ἐχθροὶ ἐπενεγκόντες τὸν χωρισμόν, ὃς νῦν κατ' αὐτῶν σφοδρῶς βάλλει, τοῦ "λογικοῦ" καὶ τοῦ "ψυχικοῦ" μέρους τοῦ ἐνὸς κἀδιδαιρέτου ἀνθρωπίνου θείου προσώπου! Οὐδὲν μαθόντες πάντες αὐτοὶ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τῶν τῆς χώρας πολλῶν παθημάτων καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ σύμπαντος ἐπὶ γῆς κόσμου πολλῶν μαθημάτων ἀρνούνται τὴν οὐσίαν τῶν δύο ἐξουσιῶν, ὅτι δηλαδὴ εἰσὶν αὗται μόνον δημόσια λειτουργήματα τοῦ ἐλευθέρου προσώπου-πολίτου ὑπηρετικά, οὐχὶ δ' ἀληθεῖς ἀνατολικαὶ καταπιεστικαὶ δεσποτεῖαι! Τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τὸ μέγα κατόρθωμα, ἀγωγή, καὶ συμπεριφορὰ τῶν ἡγετῶν καὶ δημοσίως προβαλλομένων "διανοουμένων" τῆς χώρας αὐτῆς, ἀνευ τινὸς συναισθήσεως, ἅρ' οὐδέ τινος ἐντροπῆς, ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν περιφερομένων ὥς ἀντιπροσώπων καὶ πρεσβευτῶν τῆς ἱστορίας καὶ τοῦ ὅλου πολιτισμοῦ αὐτῆς τῆς χώρας ἡμῶν!

ΤΑ ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΑ ΤΑΥΤΟΤΗΤΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΟΥ-ΠΟΛΙΤΟΥ

Οὐδεὶς ἀντιλαμβάνεται ὅτι ὡς ἑαυτοῦ Λογικῶς σύμμεικτος ὑποχρεωτική-ἐλευθέρα ταυτότητος πιστοποίησις, τὸ τοῦ προσώπου-πολίτου δελτίον ταυτότητος [ἀνεξαρτήτως τοῦ τίτλου αὐτοῦ] ὥφειλεν εἶναι ἀπαραβίαστον ἔννορον δικαστικὸν ἔγγραφο, τῆς ἀκριβείας καὶ ἀληθείας τῶν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ στοιχείων, ὧν τῶν πάντων γνωστῶν αὐτῷ τε καὶ ταῖς ἀρχαῖς, ὑποκειμένων εἰς βαρεῖαν ποινὴν ψευδορκίας!¹⁰

¹⁰ Συναφῶς, ποία ἄρα "λογικὴ" ἐπιβάλλει ὅπως ἡ Πολιτεία ἀνέχεται πλείονας τῶν ἐλαχίστων ἀπαραιτήτων τύπους δελτίων ταυτότητος διὰ τὰς διαφόρους κατηγορίας τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐπικρατεῖα αὐτῆς κατοικούντων; Πῶς οὐκ ἂν ἦν ἀρτιωτέρα ἡ ἐποπτεία, εἰ ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν τύπων τῶν δελτίων ἦν ὁ ἐλάχιστος ἀπαραίτητος διὰ τὴν ἀκριβῆ τε καὶ πλήρη περιγραφὴν τῶν κυκλοφορούντων προσώπων; Ἴνα σαφῆς γένομαι, πῶς ὁ ἐν τοῖσδε ἀναμφιβόλου ἀνασφαλείας καιροῖς φρουρὸς τῆς εἰς τὴν ἐπισφαλοῦς ἀσφαλείας ἡμῶν ἀστυφύλαξ οὐκ ἂν ἐβοηθεῖτο ἐπ' ὠφελείᾳ ἡμῶν καὶ τῆς χώρας, εἰ πάντα τὰ δελτία ταυτότητος πάντων τῶν ἐν Ἑλλάδι κυκλοφορούντων προσώπων ἦν ἐν τῇ Ἑλληνικῇ (ἵνα ἢ παρ' αὐτοῦ ἀναγνώσιμα), τοῦ αὐτοῦ μεγέθους καὶ σχήματος (πλὴν ἄλλου κατὰ περίπτωσιν χρώματος, κυανοῦ διὰ τοὺς Ἑλληνας, ἐρυθροῦ διὰ τοὺς κοινούς λοιποὺς πάντας, λευκοῦ διὰ τοὺς διπλωμάτας), ἐνθ' ἀναγκαίως ὡσαύτως ἀνήκουσι πρότερον ὀνόματα, τὸ ἐπάγγελμα, σπουδαία τις ἄλλη ιδιότης, ὥς καὶ ἡ παρούσα καὶ προτέρα "ὑπηκοότης"-ἐθνικότης (nationality) τῶν κατόχων αὐτῶν; Πῶς ἂρ' ἐσμὲν λογικοί, εἴτ' ἐσμὲν πολιτικοί, εἴτ' ἐσμὲν κληρικοί, εἴτ' ἐσμὲν λαϊκοί, ἀπορρίπτοντες τὴν ἀπόλυτον λογικότητα καὶ χρησιμότητα τῆς προτάσεως; Πῶς ἀπορρίπτοντες ταύτην ἀποφευξόμεθα τὴν κατηγορίαν *ποινηρᾶς διαθέσεως παρὰ πᾶν προβαλλόμενον πρόσχημα*; Ἀτελής ἐστὶν οὗτος ὁ κόσμος, καὶ οὐκ ἐργαζόμεθα τέλειον ποιῆσαι αὐτόν, τινὲς ἡμῶν χαίροντες *κακοπίστως* ἐπὶ τῇ ἀτελείᾳ αὐτοῦ! Μὴ οὖν λέγωμεν ὅτι διὰ τῆς προτάσεως μειοῦται *δῆθεν* ἡ γενικὴ ἐλευθερία

Στοιχεία βιολογικά-φυσικά, διὰ βίου δηλωτικά τοῦ προσώπου-πολίτου, ἀναμφιβόλως ἀνήκουσιν ἐπὶ τοῦ δελτίου ταυτότητος! Τοιαῦτά ἐστὶν ἡ περιγραφή τοῦ προσώπου, τὸ δακτυλικὸν ἀποτύπωμα, τὰ αἱματολογικὰ χαρακτηριστικά! Ὡς οὐδεὶς συνετὸς ἄνθρωπος δύνατ' ἀρνεῖσθ' ὅτι οἱ παρόντες καιροὶ εἰσὶ πονηροί, πᾶς *κἂν καθ' ὑπολογισμόν ἢ φόβον ἀρνούμενος* δηλοῦν τὰ ἴδι' αὐτοῦ βιολογικά-φυσικά στοιχεῖα οὐσίᾳ ἀρνεῖται πιστοποιεῖν ἑαυτόν, ὁπότε πᾶς συναλλασσόμενος μετ' αὐτοῦ δικαιούται εἶναι προσεκτικὸς δι' ἰδίαν ἀσφάλειαν! *Πᾶσα* τῆς ἀληθείας αὐτῆς ἄρνησις οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐκ προθέσεως ἀγαθῆς! Ἐρωτᾶται, π.χ., τίς ὠφελεῖτ' ἐκ τῆς ἀποκρύψεως τοῦ δακτυλικοῦ ἀποτυπώματος, ὁ ἀγαθὸς πολίτης ἢ ὁ κακοποιός; Πῶς οὐχ ὁ δεύτερος μόνος; *Πῶς* οὖν ἡ πολιτεία, καὶ δὴ ἡ κυβέρνησις, συντάσσεται μετὰ τῶν κακοποιῶν, οὐχὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν αὐτῆς πολιτῶν, ἀπαιτοῦσα ἀπὸ τῆς ἀστυνομίας ἐκδιδόναι δελτία ταυτότητος *προστατευτικά τῶν κακοποιῶν*, καθιστάντα *ἕως ἀδύνατον* τὸ κατὰ νόμον κατ' αὐτῶν ἔργον αὐτῆς; *Πῶς* ἄρ' οὐκ ἐστὶν ἡ κυβερνητικὴ ἐμμονὴ εἰς τὴν ἀπάλειψιν τοῦ στοιχείου αὐτοῦ πρᾶξις *ιδιαιτάτα ἡλιθία ἢ καὶ εὐθέως κακόβουλος*; Ποῖον τῶν δύο τούτων ἐστὶ χεῖρον; Ὡς κατὰ τῆς ἐμμονῆς ταύτης οὐδεὶς ὁμιλεῖ, μήπως κακοποιοὶ ἐπ' ἀμφοτέρων τὰς ἐξουσίας ἀνερριχήθησαν; Ἐρωτᾶται· μήπως ὁ ἀγαθὸς πολίτης ἀσφαλίζειτ' ἐνίοτε κάλλιον διὰ τῆς ὡς ἀποκρύφωσιν τηρήσεως στοιχείων τινῶν; *Ἀναμφιβόλως, πλην κατὰ περίπτωσιν!* Καθότι *χοὶ λοιποὶ συναλλασσόμενοι μετ' αὐτοῦ χῆ ὅλη κοινωνία προσώπων δικαιούνται ἴσης αὐτῷ ἀσφαλίσεως*, ἥτις οὐκ ἀσφαλίζειτ' ἐὰν οὐσιώδη στοιχεῖα ταυτότητος ἀπόκρυφα παραμένωσι πέραν σημείου τινὸς μεταβλητοῦ κατὰ περίπτωσιν! Ἀποτελεῖ ἀνοίκειον ἀστεϊότητα τὸ δοκεῖν ὅτι ὁ ἀγαθὸς πολίτης ἀσφαλίζειτ' ἀπὸ τῆς πο-

ῆμῶν! *Μόνῃ* ἡ πρὸς τὸ ἔγκλημα ἐλευθερία μειοῦται· *ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀγαθόν!* Πάντων δ' αὐξάνεται ἡ ἀσφάλεια! Πῶς "διανοοῦμενοι" ταῦτα ὑπερορῶσιν ὡς ὁμφάκας, καὶ ἐξοργίζονται διὰ τὸ ἐκ τούτου ἀποκαλεῖν αὐτοὺς ἀλώπεκας πονηράς; Οὐχ οἱ ἀγαθοὶ προὔκαλεσαν τὴν ἀνασφάλειαν τῶνδε καιρῶν! Πῶς ἐσμέν συνετοὶ μᾶλλον ἢ ἄφρονες, ἀσυνέτως πρὸ τοῦ κινδύνου φερόμενοι;

Γνωστὴ ἐστὶν ἡ τῆς τελευταίας ἐξηκονταετίας ἱστορία τῆς χώρας, διχασθείσης διὰ τὴν ἐπ' ἀνατολῇ τε καὶ δύσει τοῦ κόσμου διαίρεσιν. Μεγάλως τὸ ἔθνος διὰ τὴν ἐθνικὴν ἐπανάνωσιν προσεπάθησεν ἀπαλεῖψαι τὴν μνήμην ἐκείνου τοῦ διχασμοῦ. Ἐν ἡ προσπάθειά ὡς οὐκ ὤφειλε περιέλαβε καὶ τὴν ἀπάλειψιν τῆς μνήμης τῶν τότε κατ' αὐτοῦ γενομένων μεγάλων σφαλμάτων, παρ' ὧν φεῦ οὕτως ὡς οὐδὲν ἐδιδάχθη! Διὰ τοῦτο τᾶριστερον μέρος τοῦ διχασμοῦ οὐδέποτε μετενόησεν οὐδέ *συνιτίσθη* διὰ τὴν εἰς τοὺς βορείους γείτονας ὑποσχεθείσαν παράδοσιν τῶν βορείων ἐθνικῶν ἐδαφῶν εἰς πληρωμὴν τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸ βοηθείας ἐκείνων κατὰ τὴν τούτου τοῦ μέρους προσπάθειαν *πραξικοπηματικῆς, οὐ δημοκρατικῆς*, καταλήψεως τῆς ἀρχῆς, κατ' ἀντιγραφὴν τῶν ἐν *Ῥωσσίᾳ γεγενημένων* κατὰ τὴν ἐκεῖ κομμουνιστικὴν ἐπανάστασιν! Εὐρισκομένη νῦν ἐπ' ἀρχῇ ἢ ἐπ' ἀνατολᾷ τότε προσβλέψασα τῆς χώρας παράταξις πολλὰ πλέον ἐπιχειρεῖ πρὸς νόθευσιν τοῦ ἐθνικοῦ χαρακτῆρος, ἀρνηθεῖσα ἐλέγχει καὶ ἐμποδίζει τὴν εἰς τὴν χώραν ὅλως παράνομον εἰσοδὸν μεγάλου ἀριθμοῦ ξένων, ὑπόπτων, ὡς καὶ κακοποιῶν ἐτι στοιχείων! Διερωτᾶται πᾶς νουνεχὴς· μήπως ἡ τότε πρὸς τοὺς γείτονας παραχώρησις οὐδέποτ' ἀνακληθεῖσα νῦν πραγματοποιεῖται διὰ τῆς ἐπιβούλου νέας αὐτῆς εἰσβολῆς τῶν βορείων, ἐπιχειρουμένης ἀποκρυβῆναι διὰ τῆς *σιωπηρᾶς καὶ δῆθεν συννόμου παραχωρήσεως εἰς αὐτοὺς ὡς καὶ πολλοὺς ἄλλους παρανόμως εἰσερχομένους* ἐλληνικῶν δελτίων "ταυτότητος" ἀποκρυπτόντων τὴν ἀληθὴ τῶν κατόχων ταυτότητα; Πῶς ἀσφαλίζεται καὶ ἡ ἐνότης τοῦ ἔθνους καὶ ἡ ἀσφάλεια αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς οὐδέποτε παυσάσης βορείου καὶ ἄλλης ἐπιβουλῆς, πρὸς ἣν τὸ παρὸν ἐλληνικὸν κράτος *συμπράττει* δι' "ἀνθρωπιστικούς" δῆθεν λόγους;

λιτείας ἢ πονηρῶν τρίτων ἐὰν τὰ βιολογικά-φυσικά στοιχεῖα αὐτοῦ "ἀπόρρητα" μείνωσιν! Ὅτι οὐδέν τῇ πολιτείᾳ ἀπόρρητον· οἱ δὲ πονηροὶ ἔχουσι τρόπον, ταύτης οὔσης διεφθαρμένης! Φέρων ἐπὶ τοῦ δελτίου ταυτότητος τὸ δακτυλικὸν αὐτοῦ ἀποτύπωμα, ἀσφαλίζει ἐναντι τρίτων τὰ κριβέες τῶν λοιπῶν ἰδίων στοιχείων, ἅτιν' εὐκόλως πλέον δύναται πλαστῶς ἀντιγράφεσθαι! Φέρων ἐπὶ τοῦ δελτίου ταυτότητος τὸν αἱματολογικὸν αὐτοῦ χαρακτήρα, ἀσφαλίζεται κατὰ καθυστερήσεως ἀμέσου ἐπεμβάσεως λόγῳ ἀγνοίας τῶν στοιχείων αὐτῶν εἰς περίπτωσιν ἀτυχήματος ἢ ἱατρικῆς κρίσεως! Ἀπὸ δ' ἀγαθῶν, ἀγαθὸς οὐ κινδυνεύει!

Ἄλλ' ὁ πολίτης ὡς ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἐστὶ σὰρξ μόνη ὡς ἄλλο τι ζῶν, εἰ καὶ ὠφελοῦνται αἱ ἐξουσίαι τοιοῦτο αὐτὸν θεωρεῖν διὰ τὸ κατάρχειν! Ἔστι καὶ πρόσωποι, πλείστας κοινωνικὰς ἔχον διασυνδέσεις, δι' ὧν τίς ἐστιν ἐμφαίνεται!: Τὸ πλήρες ἴδιον ὄνομα, τὸ πατρώνυμον, τὸ μητρώνυμον, τὸ συζυγώνυμον, τὸ ἐπάγγελμα, τὴν σπουδαίαν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ὡς πρώτην κοινωνικὴν καὶ ὁμολογιακὴν τοῦ ὅλου νοῦ αὐτοῦ ιδιότητα! Μόνος ὁ πολίτης δικαιούται ἀποφασίσαι ποῖα τῶν προαιρετικῶν στοιχείων αὐτοῦ ἐπιθυμεῖ πιστοποιεῖν αὐτόν! Κἂν μεταβάλῃ αὐτά, πάντως ὀφείλει δηλῶσαι τὴν μεταβολὴν, διὰ τὴν Λογικὴν νομικὴν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν συνανθρώπων ἀσφάλισιν! Κἂν ἐλευθέρως ἀποφασίσῃ δεικνύναι αὐτά, οὐδεὶς, οὐδ' αὕτη ἡ πολιτεία συγκειμένη ἐξ ἐλευθέρων προσώπων ἐξ ὧν μόνων λαμβάνει τὴν ἑαυτῆς νομιμότητα, δικαιούται ἐμποδίσαι αὐτὸν τοῦτο ποιεῖν, ἕτερον οὐδένα διὰ τῆς πράξεως αὐτοῦ ταύτης μόνης προσβάλλοντα!

ΑΙ ΕΞ ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΕΩΣ ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΩΝ ΠΙΘΑΝΑΙ ΑΔΙΚΟΠΡΑΞΙΑΙ

Ἡ διὰ κακῆς χρήσεως τῆς ἐπαγγελματικῆς, ἢ ἐκκλησιαστικῆς, ἢ ἄλλης τινὸς ιδιότητος πιθανὴ παράνομος ἀλληλομεταχειρίσις τῶν πολιτῶν, οὐσα κεχωρισμένη αὐτόνομος πράξις, χρήζει κεχωρισμένης μεταχειρίσεως, καὶ οὐδόλως ἐπιτρέπει τὴν προληπτικὴν στέρησιν τῆς ἐλευθερίας τῆς προσωπικῆς τούτων πιστοποιήσεως! Ἡ στέρησις αὕτη, παρ' ὅτι ὑποστηρίζεται ὡς γενικὸν εὐεργετικὸν μέτρον, οὐσίᾳ σκοπεῖ εἰς μόνην τὴν διευκόλυνσιν τῆς πολιτικῆς ἐξουσίας καὶ ὅσων δι' αὐτῆς ἐπιδιώκουσιν ἴδια ὠφελήματα, κοῦδ' ἐπὶ στιγμὴν παύει εἶναι ἀστυνομικὸν μέτρον, ὅμοιον, π.χ., τῇ ἀπαγορεύσει συγκεντρώσεώς τινος πολιτῶν διὰ τὸν κίνδυνον ταραχῶν. Ἐν πάσῃ τοιαύτῃ περιπτώσει σταθμίζεται ἡ πιθανότης ταραχῶν καὶ ὁ ἐξ αὐτῶν κίνδυνος πρὸς τὴν ζημίαν τῆς προσκαίρου ἀπωλείας ἐλευθερίας. Οὐδεὶς, πλην ὑπὸ στρατιωτικὸν καθεστῶς, διανοεῖτ' ἐπιβαλεῖν μόνιμον ἐπὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ ἀπαγόρευσιν συγκεντρώσεων διὰ τὴν πιθανὴν ἐμφάνισιν ἐν τιν' αὐτῶν, ἐν χρόνῳ ἀπροσδιορίστῳ, ὅλως ἀσταθμίου κινδύνου! Ἀσφαλῶς τινες τῶν γεννωμένων ἀνθρώπων ἐξελλίσονται εἰς ἐγκληματίας! Μὴν ἡ νέα αὕτη παρ' ἡμῖν "λογικὴ" ἄρ' ἐπιβάλλει τὸν βέβαιον πρότερον φόνον τοῦ ἔτι ἀγνώστου ἡμῖν μελλοντικοῦ ἐγκληματίου ἵνα προληφθῇ τὸ παρ' αὐτοῦ πιθανῶς τελεσθησόμενον ἐγκλημα;¹¹ Καὶ τούτου μὴ ὄντος ἐκ τῶν προτέρων γνωστοῦ, μὴν

¹¹ Ὑπενθυμίζετ' ἐν προκειμένῳ ἡ μετὰ τὸν δεύτερον παγκόσμιον πόλεμον εὐρεία συζήτησις, κυρίως ἐν τῇ παγκοσμίῳ Ἰουδαϊκῇ κοινότητι, ἐπὶ τοῦ ἂν τις εἴη δεδικαιωμένος ὡς οὐδὲν ἐγκλημα διαπράξας, εἰ τὴν τοῦ Χίτλερ μετεξέλιξιν προγιγνώσκων προβαίῃ εἰς τὸν προληπτικὸν αὐτοῦ φόνον· πολλῶν ἐξ αὐτῶν ὑποστηρικτῶν ἀκριβῶς αὐτό!!!

ἄρ' αὐτὴ δικαιολογεῖ *Λογικῶς-ἐπαρκῶς* τὴν *γενικὴν ἀπαγόρευσιν* τῶν γεννήσεων; "Οὐ ζήσεται ἄνθρωπος ὅστις οὐχ ἁμαρτήσῃ"! Διατί οὖν ἄρ' ὁ Θεὸς ἐδημιούργησε τὸ τὸτ' ἐξελιχθισόμενον, καὶ νῦν ἤδη ἐξελιχθέν, εἰς *λίαν ἁμαρτωλὸν* γένος ἀνθρώπων; Τί ἄρ' ἔχουσιν οἱ "διανοούμενοι" ἀπαντῆσ' ἐπ' αὐτοῦ; Ὡς ὁ Θεός (δι' αὐτοὺς μόνῃ ἢ "φύσιν") ἐποίησεν αὐτοὺς *ἐλευθέρους ὡς καὶ πρὸς θάμαρτάνειν*, πῶς οὗτοι, ἐπ' ὀνόματι τῆς δῆθεν ἀπαραβίαστου *γενικῆς ἐλευθερίας* (ἧς χάριν καὶ ἐγκληματοῦντας ἀναρχικοὺς στέργουσιν), ἐπιμένουσι στερεῖν *προληπτικῶς τὴν εἰδικὴν ἐλευθερίαν* τοῦ πῶς κοινωνικῶς ἁμαρτάνειν, *κοῦ στέργουσι τιμωρεῖν μόνῃ τὴν διαπραχθεῖσαν ἀδικίαν*; Πῶς παραλογιζομένους ἑαυτοὺς σέβονται; Καὶ πῶς ἀπαιτοῦσι παρ' ἡμῶν σεβασμόν; Μὴ προσπαθοῦσιν εἰσαγαγεῖν καινὴν "φιλοσοφίαν" δικαίου; Ὅποια ὄντως "φιλοσοφία"!

Ἄλλ' ἔστι καὶ ἑτέρα σοβαρωτάτη, *καθαρῶς ἠθικὴ*, τοῦ ὡς ἄνω ζητήματος διασύνδεσις, ἣν οἱ ἐκ φόβου ὀρμώμεν' ἀντιτιθέμεν' εἰς τὴν δῆλωσιν τοῦ θρησκευματος κομμουνισταί, ἄθεοι, δῆθεν προοδευτικοὶ διανοούμενοι καὶ Ἑβραῖοι [τῶν λοιπῶν θρησκευτικῶν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ μειονοτήτων, ἰδίᾳ τῶν *ἀν-ξανοουσῶν* τοὺς ἀριθμοὺς τῶν μελῶν αὐτῶν, *μᾶλλον προτιμωσῶν πιθανῶς τὴν ἐπίσημον δῆλωσιν τοῦ θρησκευματος* καὶ τὴν ἀσφάλισιν δι' αὐτῆς τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ καὶ τῶν δικαιωμάτων τῶν μελῶν αὐτῶν] προτιμῶσιν ὑπερορᾶν: Δηλοῦσι γὰρ πάντες αὐτοὶ ὅτι ἡ προαιρετικὴ δῆλωσις τοῦ θρησκευματος ποιεῖ τοὺς μὴ δηλοῦντας αὐτὸ αἰσθάνεσθ' ἑαυτοὺς μειονεκτοῦντας *ἠθικῶς* (ὡς ὅτι ἄλλως οὐδὲν ἔχει νόημα ἢ *τοιαύτη αἰσθανομένη μειονεξία αὐτῶν*) ἔναντι τῶν δηλούντων! Ἐρωτᾶται· πῶς βέβαιοι ἐν ἑαυτοῖς διὰ τὴν οἶαν ἂν εἴη ἑαυτῶν πίστιν ὄντες αἰσθάνοντ' ἠθικῶς μειούμενοι μᾶλλον ἢ ὑπερέχοντες ἔναντι τῶν δηλούντων; Μὴ τοῦτο συμβαίνει διότι *ἐνδομύχως ὁμολογοῦσι τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἔλλειψιν θάρρους ὁμολογίας* τῆς ἑαυτῶν πίστεως; Πῶς Ἕλληνες ὄντες δεξόμεθα διάγειν ἐν κοινωνίᾳ ὑφ' ὅρους δειλίας; Πῶς τιμᾷ ἀνθρώπους γενναίους ἢ τοιαύτη ἀπαίτησις; Ἐρωτᾶται ὡσαύτως· ποιεῖ, ναὶ ἢ οὐ, τοὺς πονηροὺς αἰσθάνεσθ' ἑαυτοὺς μειονεκτοῦντας ἢ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐμφάνισίς τινος ἀγαθοῦ; Κατὰ τὴν νῦν γενικὴν καὶ ὡς "λογικὴν" δηλουμένην στάσιν ταύτην τοῦ *ἠνωμένου μετώπου* τῆς κυβερνήσεως, τί ἄρα δεῖ ποιεῖν τῷ πολίτῃ τῷ ἀγαθῷ, ἵνα μὴ μειῶνται οἱ πονηροί; Ἐξορίσαι ἢ ἐκτελέσαι αὐτόν; "Λογικώτερόν" ἔστι τὸ δεύτερον! Ὅτι διὰ παντὸς ἀπαλλάσσονται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ! Ἐχομεν ἤδη τὸ παράδειγμα τῆς Σταυρώσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ! Δι' οὗ κατηγοροῦνται οἱ *πονηροί, οὐχὶ γενικῶς οἱ Ἑβραῖοι*· ὡς ὅτι οὐδεμία βεβαιότης ὑπάρχει ὅτι καὶ ἄλλοι οὐχ ὁμοίως αὐτοῖς ἐποιοῦν Αὐτῷ ἂν, εἰ ἐν τῷ μέσῳ ἄλλων τινῶν Ἐκεῖνος ἐνεφανίζετο! Ἐχομεν ἄλλωστε καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν τὸ *προηγθὲν κατηγοροῦν* παράδειγμα τῆς καταδίκης Σωκράτους! Ἀληθῶς, μὴν οἱ διὰ τὸν λόγον αὐτὸν ἀντιτιθέμεν' εἰς τὴν προαιρετικὴν ἀναγραφὴν τοῦ θρησκευματος ἐννοοῦσιν ὑπὸ γενικὸν τιθέναι διωγμὸν τοὺς πολίτας τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς, ἵνα μὴ πρὸ κείνων μειονεκτῶσιν; Ὁφείλουσιν ἀποκαλύψαι τὴν ἑαυτῶν πρόθεσιν, εἰ τίμιοι! Ὅτι καὶ τοῦτο γε λέγω· πῶς πονηρὸς ἔστι τίμιος; Λέγεθ' ὅτι πολλαπλῶς πιέζει ἡμᾶς ἡ Εὐρώπη; Ἰδοὺ προκαλοῦσα ἡμᾶς *λαμπρὰ εὐκαιρία διδασκαλίας* λαῶν ἐπὶ *πολιτισμῷ κατὰ τὰ αἰωνίως διαρκῆ ἑλληνικὰ πρότυπα*! Διατί ἢ παρ' ἡμῖν ἠνωμένη ἀριστερά (ὡς καὶ ἡ Ἑλληνικὴ Ἐκκλησία) *ἀρνεῖται* τὴν παγκόσμιον αὐτὴν πρόκλησιν;

Ψευδεπίγραφόν ἐστὶν ἄρα τὸ δῆθεν "ἠθικόν" κατὰ τῆς ἀναγραφῆς στοιχείων προσωπικῶν μέτωπον!

ΑΝΑΙΤΙΟΙ ΦΟΒΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΣΥΓΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ ΣΚΟΠΙΜΟΣ

Τὰ δημοσίως πλὴν ἀνευθύνως λεγόμενα περὶ ἀπορρήτων [ὡς κάπο τοῦ κατόχου τοῦ δελτίου] στοιχείων, *ἠλεκτρονικῶς ἐπ' αὐτοῦ καταγεγραμμένων*, μόνον ὡς θλιβεραὶ ἀστειότητες δύναται θεωρεῖσθαι: Οὐδεμία ἔστιν ἀνάγκη ταῦτα ὑπάρχειν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ δελτίου καὶ κείσθαι ὑπὸ μόνιμον κίνδυνον ἀλλοιώσεως ἢ καὶ καταστροφῆς!: Ἡ διὰ διασταυρώσεως (*cross referencing*) στοιχείων τῶν παλαιῶν καὶ νέων δελτίων ταυτότητος (*κἂν μὴ παραληφθῶσι τὰ δεύτερα ὑπὸ τῶν κατόχων αὐτῶν*) πρόσβασις εἰς ἀρχεῖα προσωπικῶν δεδομένων ἐστὶ πανεύκολος διὰ πάντ' ἔχοντα πρόσβασιν εἰς αὐτά! Ἐφ' ὅσον τοιαῦτ' ἀρχεῖα ἤδη τηρεῖται καὶ πολλαπλῶς ἐστὶ χρήσιμα, ζητουμένη ἐστὶ *μόνη ἢ πλήρης ἀπόλυτος φύλαξις* τῶν ἀρχείων κατὰ *πάσης ὑφ' οἴου-δήποτε κακῆς* αὐτῶν χρήσεως! Ὅμως, *οὐδεμία τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῖν δύο ἐξουσιῶν νῦν πείθει ὅτι καλῶς κατανοεῖ τὸ πρόβλημα τοῦτο*, ἢ ἱκανῶς ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἐργάζεται! Ἡ πολιτεία ἔθηκε τὴν φύλαξιν τῶν ἀρχείων καὶ τὰς περὶ αὐτῶν ἀποφάσεις ὑπ' ἀρχὴν *δῆθεν "ἀνεξάρτητον"* δηλουμένην! Ἀλλὰ διεθνῶς, ἢ ἔννοια τῶν "ἀνεξαρτήτων" ἀρχῶν οὐδόλως ἐστὶν οἷα *κακοβούλως* παρ' ἡμῖν ἐμφανίζεται: Οὕτω καλοῦνται ἀρχαὶ κρινόμεναι πέραν τῶν δικαιοδοσιῶν τῶν *καθ' ἕκαστα ὑπουργείων*, συνιστάμεναι ἵν' ἐπιλαμβάνωνται προβλημάτων ἀπαιτούντων *σύντονον καὶ περίπλοκον* δράσιν, ὡς ἐκεῖνα διὰ ἃ παρ' ἡμῖν λέγεται ὅτι προΐσταντ' αὐτῶν "συναρμόδιοι ὑπουργοί", ὧν *οὐδεὶς* περὶ αὐτὰ ἐστὶν ἐπιτήδειος! Ἐν *οὐδεμιᾷ* περιπτώσει αἱ τοιαῦται ἀρχαί, *οὐσαι οὐσίᾳ ἐκτελεστικάι*, εἰσὶ πέραν τῆς κεφαλῆς τῆς ἐκτελεστικῆς ἐξουσίας [τοῦ προέδρου, ἐν Η.Π.Α.] ὑφ' ἣν κεῖνται πᾶσαι αἱ δημόσιαι [όμοσπονδιακαί, ἐν Η.Π.Α.] ἐκτελεστικάι ἀρχαί, ἢ πέραν τοῦ συνταγματικῶς διατασσομένου ἐλέγχου τῶν νομοθετικῶν σωμάτων [ὑφ' ἃ κεῖνται *πᾶς* αἱ κρατικάι λειτουργίαι, πλὴν τῆς ἐσωτερικῆς δομῆς τῆς δικαστικῆς ἐξουσίας καὶ καθ' ὃ μέτρον ἀσφαλίζεται τὸ *παντελῶς ἀνεπηρέαστον*, ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων δύο ἀρχῶν, τῶν δικαστικῶν ἀποφάσεων], ἅτινα νομοθετοῦντα περὶ τῆς συστάσεως καὶ λειτουργίας αὐτῶν *μόνον παρ' ἡλιθίων ἢ κακοβούλων* δύναται λέγεσθαι ὅτι ἀπεκδύονται ὕστερον τῆς συνταγματικῆς ὑποχρεώσεως ἐλέγχου *καὶ τῶν "ἀνεξαρτήτων" ἀρχῶν!* Ἀληθῶς ἐκφεύγει ἀπὸ τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἡγετῶν ὅτι τοιαῦτα περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἑλλάδι *δῆθεν "ἀνεξαρτήτων" ἀρχῶν* λέγοντες *ἐκτιθέ-ασαι* τὴν χώραν ἡμῶν εἰς τὴν *ἀπολύτως δεδικαιολημένην χλεῦν* τῶν ξένων, καὶ τὴν ἀπ' αὐτῆς ἐκείνης *κακὴν* παρ' αὐτῶν μεταχειρίσιν, ἣν ἐκεῖνοι τὰ τῶν χωρῶν αὐτῶν ὑπερασπιζόμενοι *οὐκ* ἐπιδεικνύασιν; Ἐρωτᾶται: ἀνεδίφησέ ποτε μέλος τῆς κυβερνήσεως, ἢ τοῦ κοινοβουλίου, ἢ τῆς ἀρχῆς ταύτης *καλὸν ξενικόν τι Who is Who; Πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα γέμουσι χρησιμοτάτων δημοσίων πληροφοριῶν, ἐλευθέρως παρεχομένων καὶ προσβατῶν ὑπὸ παντὸς ἐνδιαφερομένου*, νῦν παρ' ἡμῖν καλουμένων "ἀπορρήτων ἐναισθητῶν προσωπικῶν δεδομένων"! *Τί οὖν ἀληθῶς λέγομεν;* Ὅτι καὶ περὶ τούτου τὸν κόσμον

πάντα διδάξομεν; "Ότι παράνομά ἐστι πάντα τὰ **Who is Who**; "Ότι ἀπαγορεύεται πλέον ἐν Ἑλλάδι ἡ συλλογή τε καὶ δημοσίευσις τοιούτων συλλογῶν; *Πῶς* σοβαρὸν καὶ εὐνομούμενον ἔθνος λέγομεν ἑαυτούς; Γελῶσιν οἱ πέραν τῶν συνόρων ἡμῶν ἄνθρωποι! "Ἡ μάλλον, μόνον τοῦτο ἐπιχειρεῖται, τουτέστι πῶς μειοῦσιν ἀνενερέυνθ' ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν οἱ *δῆθεν* σπουδαῖοι τῆς πολιτείας καὶ κοινωνίας ἡμῶν; Πῶς ὠραίαν τὴν πατρίδα ἡμῶν ἐπιδείκνυμεν τοῖς λαοῖς! "Ἡ μήπως καὶ τοῦτο ἐπιχειρεῖται, τουτέστιν ὅπως ψηφίζωσιν κάποδέχωνται οἱ Ἕλληνες ὡς ἡγέτας ἀνθρώπους *ἀγνώστους* αὐτοῖς, *ἀπόρρητον* τηροῦντας τὴν τε καταγωγὴν, προέλευσιν, παιδείαν, ἱκανότητα, προτιμήσεις, τάσεις, ἐπαγγελματικὰς καὶ λοιπὰς διασυνδέσεις αὐτῶν, ὅφ' ὧν *πάντων* καθορίζεται καὶ προσδιορίζεται ἡ ὅλη ποιότης αὐτῶν ὡς προσώπων; *Διατί* οὖν ἄρ' ἀπαγορεύεται τοῖς Ἕλλησι γινώσκειν περὶ τῶν πολιτικῶν, θρησκευτικῶν καὶ κοινωνικῶν ἡγετῶν αὐτῶν πάνθ' ἅπερ κάλλιστα γνωστά ἐστι τοῖς ξένοις ἡγέταις, μεθ' ὧν οἱ ἡμῶν συναλλάσσονται; *Πῶς* βεβαιούμεθα ὅτι ἀρτίως ἡ χώρα ἀντιπροσωπεύεται, ὅταν ὁ ἔλεγχος τῶν ἀντιπροσώπων αὐτῆς ἢ ἡμῖν ἄγνωστος καὶ ἀδύνατος; *Διατί οὐδ'* ἡ Ἐκκλησία λέγει τι περὶ τούτου τοῦ ὄντως σπουδαιοτάτου; *Πῶς* ἀσφαλίζονται κατ' ἀδικοπραξιῶν τὰ πρόσωπα-μέλη τάποτελοῦντα τὸ αὐτῆς πλήρωμα, ἅτινα *ταυτοχρόνως* τυγχάνουσι καὶ πολίται τῆς χώρας; "Ἡ ἄρα τοῦτο συμβαίνει διότι οὐδόλως περὶ τῶν τοιαύτων καὶ αὐτὴ ἐνδιαφέρεται, *μακρόθεν ἐπιβάλλουσα* τῷ "ποιμνίῳ" ἱερεῖς τε καὶ ἱεράρχας *οὓς οὐκ ἐκλέγουσιν αἱ τοπικαὶ ἐκκλησίαι*, ἀφ' οὗ τὴν χεῖρ' αὐτῶν ἀσπάζεσθαι ἀπαιτεῖ, *παρὰ τὴν καθαρωτάτην Χριστοῦ ἀπαγόρευσιν*;

Ἄλλ' οὐδεμία τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἀντιμαχομένων ἐξουσιῶν προβληματίζεται ἢ τιμίως πληροφορεῖ τοὺς πολίτας περὶ τῶν προβλημάτων αὐτῶν! *Σύμπασα* ἡ ἀριστερά, παλαιόθεν βάλλουσα κατὰ τῶν "φακέλων" (πλὴν *μόνον* κατὰ τῶν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀντιπάλων αὐτῆς τηρουμένων!) νῦν συντάσσεται *κατὰ* τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, θεωροῦσα αὐτὴν ἐχθρὸν μείζονα, *οὐχὶ δὲ ἴσως καὶ κατὰ τῶν "φακέλων"*, πλὴν μόνον ἵνα δι' αὐτῶν βάλη κατὰ τῶν *δῆθεν* ἐμπνευστῶν τῆς "παγκοσμιοποιήσεως" Δυτικῶν, ὑπὲρ ἧς, ἄλλ' ὅμως χρώματος ἐρυθροῦ, ἀόκνως εἰργάσθησαν ἕως πτώσεως καὶ οἱ τέως φίλοι αὐτῆς! Ἡ ὑποκρισία αὐτῆς ἐστὶ φανερά, ὡς ὅτι *οὐδόλως περὶ τῆς ἐν παντὶ καλῆς* χρήσεως τῶν ἀρχείων ἐνδιαφέρεται! Προφανῶς *προσδοκᾷ ἔχειν πρόσβασιν* εἰς τὰρχεῖα, ὥστ' ἐμποδίσειν τὴν *κατὰ τῶν μελῶν αὐτῆς μόνων* κακὴν αὐτῶν χρῆσιν! Ἡ δὲ πνευματικὴ δεξιὰ *κακῶς φεῖδεται* τῶν κατ' Ἐκκλησίαν ταγῶν οὓς οὐκ ἐλέγχει, αὐθις συλληφθέντας μάλιστα κατωτέρους τῶν περιστάσεων· οὐσίᾳ *καταλιπόντας τὸν Ὁρθὸν* Εὐαγγελισμόν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ παντί· *αὐτοπεριορισθέντας* ἐντὸς μὲν Ἑλλάδος εἰς τὴν "κοινωνικὴν" διακονίαν τοῦ σώματος μάλλον ἢ πνεύματος, ἐκτὸς δ' Ἑλλάδος, *ὡς ἂν αὐτὸ ἢ τὸ εὐαγγελικὸν αὐτῶν χρέος*, εἰς μόνον τὸ πῶς διατηρῆσαι "Ἑλληνικὰς" πλὴν χαμηλοτάτης ποιότητος ὡς νῦν καὶ ἐντὸς αὐτῆς τῆς Ἑλλάδος (κυρίως διὰ τῆς *ἐκκλησιαστικῆς* ἐλληνικῆς ἢν *ἐλάχιστοι* τοῦ ἐκκλησιάσματος πλέον κατανοοῦσι!) τὰς *πλέον μόνον ἐν μέρει* Ἑλληνικὰς κοινότητας, ὧν ἐντὸς μόνων

δρῶσιν ὡς ἂν οὐχ ὑπάρχη περὶ αὐτὰς ὁ μέγας ἐκεῖ λοιπὸς κόσμος (παρὰ τὰ ᾧδε δηλούμενα περὶ τῆς Ὁρθοδοξίας ἱσταμένης ὑπὲρ τοῦ κόσμου παντός)· καὶ περὶ ἀνάξι' ἄλλα κατὰ τὸ πλεῖστον τυρβάζοντας, ὡς ἀποδείκνυται ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτῶν μὴ ἔχειν ἀπάντησιν εἰς τὸ δεινὸν τοῦτο ἐρώτημα: "τί πλέον ἔτι ἀφ' ἡμῶν οὕτω κατασπαταλούντων τὸν χρόνον ὁ Θεὸς ἀναμένει ὥστε ἡμᾶς (πρόσωπα, ἔθνη, γένος ὅλον ἀνθρώπων) τηρεῖν ἐν ζωῇ;" ἢ ἔστω αὐτὸ μόνον τοῦτο: "ποία ἢ κατὰ Χριστὸν χρησιμότης τοῦ ἔτι ἐκεῖ συντηρεῖν τὸ δέσμιον ἁλλοθρήσκους καὶ ἐλάχιστον ἕως οὐδὲν πλέον κατὰ Χριστὸν ἔργον παράγον Πατριαρχεῖον τῆς Κ/πόλεως, καὶ πρὸς τί ἢ ἄρνησις τῆς μεταφορᾶς αὐτοῦ εἰς ἕτερον τόπον ὅθεν ἐκ νέου διαλάμψει τῷ κόσμῳ ὁ Λόγος Χριστοῦ;" Δῆλον γὰρ ὅτι "πᾶν δένδρον καρπὸν καλὸν μὴ ποιοῦν κόπτεται καὶ εἰς τὸ πῦρ βάλλεται"! Καὶ ἡ μὲν παρ' ἀπίστων Θεῷ ὑποστήριξις τῆς ἐκεῖ παραμονῆς τοῦ Πατριαρχείου κατανοητὴ ἐστίν, ὅτι προάγει τοὺς σκοποὺς αὐτῶν! Πῶς ὅμως κατανοεῖται ἡ στάσις τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Χριστιανικῆς Ἐκκλησίας; Λησμονεῖ ὅτι καθ' ἀγιότητα μόνην ὁ Θεὸς ἀπονέμει πρωτεία, οὐ δὲ κατ' ἀνθρωπίνην ἱστορίαν πλήρη ἁμαρτιῶν; Μόνοι παράφρονες δύνανται ἐπιθυμεῖν καὶ τὸ Πατριαρχεῖον ἐκεῖ δι' "ἐθνικούς" (ποίους;;) σκοποὺς διαμένον καὶ τὸν χωρισμὸν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἀπὸ τοῦ κράτους! Τοιοῦτοι μὴ ὄντες, ἐπιθυμοῦμεν ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς εἶναι καλοὺς ἐν τοῖσδε καιροῖς πιστοὺς τοῦ Χριστοῦ; Ἐρωτήσωμεν οὖν τί ἀφ' ἡμῶν Αὐτὸς προσδοκᾷ διαγαγῶν ἡμᾶς ἐν τοῖσδε καιροῖς! "Ἄν μαθόντες ποιήσωμεν, αὐτομάτως ἐσόμεθα τότε καὶ τῆς πολιτείας ἡμῶν πολῖται χρηστοί! Τὰ λοιπὰ ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ!

Η ΑΠΟ ΤΟΥ ΠΟΛΕΜΟΥ ΤΩΝ ΔΥΟ ΕΞΟΥΣΙΩΝ ΜΕΓΑΛΗ ΤΗΣ ΧΩΡΑΣ ΖΗΜΙΑ

Οὐδεμία τῶν δύο ἐξουσιῶν φαίνεται κατανοοῦσα τὴν τῆς χώρας μεγάλην ζημίαν, ἣν αὐταὶ ἀλλήλας ἀντιμαχόμεναι κοινῶς ἀπεργάζονται! Π.χ., ἵνα μόν' ἀναφερθῶσι τὰ προφανῆ οἰκονομικά· πρὸ τοῦ διὰ τοῦ ἀσυγχωρήτως ἀνετοιμᾶστος αὐτῆς αἰφνιδιασμοῦ αὐτῆς διὰ τῆς πρωθυπουργικῆς ὑπαναχωρήσεως ἀπὸ συμπεφωνημένων, ἠναγκάσθη ἡ Ἐκκλησία ὅπως ἀπαρνηθῇ τὰ ἐξ Εὐρώπης ὡς 130 δισ. δραχμῶν! Οἱ ἀλλόδοξοι ἐργαζόμενοι Εὐρωπαῖοι ἐκ σεβασμοῦ μόνου πρὸς τὸ μέγα ἱστορικὸν καὶ λογικῶς ἀπαιτούμενον μελλοντικὸν ἔργον τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας καὶ Παραδόσεως, δι' ὅπερ οἱ Χριστιανοὶ πάντες σεμνύνονται, ἔδωκαν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ ἡμῶν τὸ ποσὸν τοῦτο· ὃ ὁ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος, αἰσθανόμενος ἑαυτὸν πιεζόμενον ἀφορήτως, ἀπεποιήθη! Πῶς καλῶς λέγουσιν οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν ὅτι καλῶς ἔπραξεν ἀποποιηθεῖς σπουδαῖον φορολογουμένων, πλὴν κάκιστα παρ' αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ καὶ τῆς ἀντιδυτικῆς ἀριστερᾶς πάσης λοιδορουμένων ἀδελφῶν δῶρον; Πῶς δικαίως ἐπιχαίρουσι διὰ τὴν ζημίαν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας οἱ κατ' αὐτῆς βάλλοντες ἀριστεροὶ τε καὶ ἄθεοι; Μὴν οὐ τοῦ ἔθνους εἰσὶ καὶ τὰ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Ἐκκλησίας; Μὴν ἐκ τῶν διὰ τῶν ἀπολεσθέντων ἐκείνων χρημάτων ἔργων πολιτισμοῦ καὶ φιланθρωπίας οὐκ ὠφελεῖτο ἂν σύμπαν τὸ ἔθνος; Τοσοῦτον ἐπὶ τέλους πλουσίους αἰσθανόμεθα ἑαυτοὺς τοιαῦτ' ἀδελφῶν δῶρ' ἀποποιοῦμενοι, ἢ ἀπλῶς ἐσμὲν κυριολεκτικῶς ἄσωτοι κατὰ τὴν εὐαγγελικὴν

ἐννοίαν σπαταλῶντες ἃ ἔχομεν, οὐδὲ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἃ ἡμῖν δίδονται; Ἐρωτήματα ὕστατα· *πῶς* εὐφυεῖς λέγονται, πλὴν προφανῶς μόνον παρ' ἡλιθίων, οἱ ἐφ' ἡμῖν πρωθυπουργός τε κἀρχιεπίσκοπος, οὕτω χειριζόμενοι τὰς ἐθνικὰς ὑποθέσεις; Πῶς τοσαύτης ζημίας ἤδη γεγωνίας τῇ χώρᾳ, οὗτοι ὡς ἀνῶριμοι παῖδες ἢ πείσμονες γέροντες ἀρνοῦνται *στενῶς* συνεργάζεσθ' ἀλλήλοις; Τοσοῦτον ἄσβεστον οὖν ἐστὶν (ἀλλὰ τότε *ἐκ ποίας οὐσιώδους* αἰτίας;) τάμοιβαῖον κατ' ἀλλήλων αὐτῶν μίσος, περὶ οὗ οἱ περὶ αὐτοὺς βδελυροὶ κόλακες οὐ τολμῶσιν αὐτοὺς ἐρωτᾶν; Ἐπὶ τέλους! Ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ λαοῦ! *Ἀπ' Αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ λαοῦ* ἀπαιτοῦνται αἱ ἀπαντήσεις τῶν ἡγετῶν-δημοσίων ὑπηρετῶν! Εἰ αὐτοὶ ἄλλως δοκοῦσιν, εἰς ἄλλον κόσμον ἐνέτυχον! Οὐκ ἐσμεν αὐτῶν δούλοι, ἀλλ' οἱ *κύριοι* τῆς χώρας αὐτῆς! *Ἀρκεῖ* οὖν ἡ τούτων καὶ πάντων μέχρι τοῦδε ἀναίδεια!

Κύριε Πρόεδρε:

Ἔστι μοι πρῶτῳ λυπηρότατον ὅτι τὸ παρὸν ἦν ἀναγκαῖον! Φεῦ! Οἱ δύο πρωταγωνισταὶ τοῦ νέου τούτου ἐθνικοῦ δράματος ἀδυνατοῦσι, περιβαλλόμενοι καὶ πειθόμεν' ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκολουθιῶν αὐτῶν, πείθειν πάντα νοοῦντα πολίτην ὅτι ἀληθῶς περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐνδιαφέρονται! Ὁ μὲν πρωθυπουργός, διὰ φράσεων ὡς *"εμεῖς* τούτο ἐπιδιώκουμε..., *εμεῖς* τούτο θέλουμε..."

(ὅπου τὸ *βαρῶς* παρ' αὐτοῦ προφερόμενον *"εμεῖς"* *καθαράν διχαστικὴν* χροιάν ἔχει), οὐδόλως πείθει ὅτι *ἐθνικὸν* μόνον, οὐχὶ *μόνον* κομματικὸν λόγον ἐκπέμπει! Οὐδέποτε ἠκούσαμεν αὐτὸν λέγειν ἡμῖν λόγῳ ἡτιολογημένῳ, καθαρῶτάτῳ, διανγεστάτῳ· Φίλοι Ἕλληνες Συμπολῖται, συνδημιουργοὶ καὶ συνυπεύθυνοι τοῦ κοινοῦ ἡμῶν μέλλοντος: "Ἐγὼ ὡς πανεπιστημιακὸς διδάσκαλος καὶ ὑπηρέτης πρώτης τῆς Ἀληθείας καὶ εἴτα ἡμῶν, σεβόμενος ἐμαυτὸν καὶ ὑμᾶς, καὶ τὴν ἱστορίαν, τὸ παρὸν καὶ τὸ μέλλον τοῦ τόπου, τοῦ ἔθνους, τοῦ κόσμου, διότι..., καὶ διότι..., καὶ διότι..., οὕτω... δέω ἀποτιμᾶν τὰ ἐθνικὰ πράγματα, καὶ πρὸς θεραπείαν καὶ ἐπίτευξιν τοῦδε... σκοποῦ, ταῦτα... λεπτομερῶς ἐν τοῖσδε... τακτοῖς χρόνοις γενέσθαι προτείνω ὑμῖν! Εἰ μὲν συμφωνεῖτε, καλῶς! Εἰ δ' οὐ, παραιτοῦμαι! Διότι *ἐπ' οὐδὲν ἔλασσον τάριστον δέχομαι, Φίλοι, ὁδηγῆσαι ὑμᾶς!* Οὗτος καιρὸς *συντόνου πορείας* ἐστί! *Παρήλθε πλέον* ὁ καιρὸς τῆς 'στοχεύσεως'!"

Τοιοῦτον ὁ νοήμων πολίτης ἐπιθυμεῖ νῦν τὸν ἡγέτην τῆς χώρας! Ὁ δ' ἀρχιεπίσκοπος, συνεχῶς ἀναφερόμενος εἰς τὴν "Ἐκκλησίαν" *ἥς μόνης* τὸ μέλλον ἐν τούτῳ τῷ κόσμῳ *ἀσφαλίσ' ἀγωνίζεται*, οὐδὲν ἀποδείκνυσιν ἐνδιαφέρον δι' *ἐκάστην* ψυχὴν! Ἀναπολὼν συνεχῶς τὸ *δῆθεν* "ἐνδοξον" βυζαντινὸν παρελθόν (ἀλλ' εἰ ἦν *σὺν Θεῷ ἐνδοξον*, διατί καὶ ἀπέθανεν;), οὐδ' ἐπὶ στιγμὴν πείθει ὅτι ἐπὶ τὸ μέλλον προσβλέπει! *Λησμονεῖ* ὅτι *παρελθόν* ἐστὶν ἡ ἱστορία! *Λησμονεῖ* ὅτι μέλλον ἢ *Κρίσις* ἐστὶν! *Λησμονεῖ* ὅτι οὐχ ἡ "Ἐκκλησία" κριθήσεται, ἀλλὰ *κεχωρισμένως ἐκάστη* ψυχὴ! Ἀγωνιζομένη ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ(;) ἐν τῷδε καιρῷ! *Ποῦ* ὅμως ἐστὶν ἡ ἀρχιεπισκοπικὴ προτροπὴ πρὸς τὸν *ἐν' αὐτὸν πολίτην-πιστὸν* ἐπὶ τὸ *αἰὲν ἐν παντὶ ἀγαθῷ ἀριστεύειν*; Τοιαύτην ποδηγεσίαν προσδοκᾷ ὁ παρὼν ἄνθρωπος, ἰδίως ὁ νέος! Ἄλλ' οὐδαμῶθεν τοιαύτη ἀκούεται!

Διὰ τοῦτο, ἀποστέλλων ἀντίγραφ' ὡς κατωτέρω, δέομαι ὑμῶν ὅπως δημοσίᾳ ἐπέμβητε!

Μετὰ πάσης τιμῆς,

Υ.Γ. Ἐκκρεμεῖ ἐν δικαστηρίοις ἡ γνωστὴ ἄλλη ἀντιδικία μεταξὺ (παρ)εκκλησιαστικῶν κύκλων καὶ τοῦ κ. Μ. Ἀνδρουλάκη, ἐξ αἰτίας τῆς παρ' αὐτοῦ, ὑπὸ τὸν πολλὰ πλὴν ὑπονοητικὸν τίτλον "Μ", συγγραφῆς προσβλητικοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἔργου καὶ τῆς παρ' ἐκείνων *δῆθεν* "σκοταδιστικῆς" δημοσίας συμβολικῆς καύσεως ἀντιτύπων αὐτοῦ, δι' ἣν οὗτοι καὶ πᾶσα ἡ Ἐκκλησία κατηγοροῦνται. Τὴν ἐνέργειαν ταύτην κατεδίκασαν καὶ *δῆθεν* πεφωτισμένοι αὐτῆς ἀπολογηταί. Παρακαλῶ λάβετε ὑπ' ὄψιν καὶ τὰκόλουθα, ἃ οὐδόλως συνεζητήθησαν: Κατὰ διεθνῇ πρακτικῇ, ὁ συγγραφεὺς διατηρεῖ μόνον τὸ **copyright** ἐπὶ τῶν ιδεῶν, οὐχὶ ὅμως καὶ τὴν ιδιοκτησίαν τοῦ βιβλίου-ἀντιτύπου, ἣτις μεταβιβάζεται εἰς τὸν ἀγοραστὴν τούτου διὰ τῆς πράξεως τῆς πωλήσεως. Αὐτὸς ὡς ιδιοκτήτης κατέχει τὸ δικαίωμα φυλάξεως ἢ καταστροφῆς τοῦ βιβλίου, *κατὰ τὴν κρίσιν αὐτοῦ μόνην*. Εἰ οὐχ οὕτω τὰ πράγματα εἶχον, ἐταφόμεθα ἂν ὑπὸ τόνους ἐντύπων! *Πῶς* οὖν ἄρα δύναται ἡ διὰ πυρὸς καταστροφή ἀντιτύπων *νομίμως* ἀγορασθέντος βιβλίου τινὸς κρίνεσθαι *χειρῶς* "σκοταδιστικῇ", *ἄνευ ἀποδεικτικῆς ἀναφορᾶς εἰς τὰ προφανῆ φωτεινὰ ἅπερ τοῦτο ἀποκαλύπτει*; Ἀσφαλῶς οἱ εἰς δημοσίαν καὶ βιβλίου προβαίνοντες καταδικάζουσι τὰς περιεχομένας ιδέας, ἀλλ' οὔτε πῶς δύναται καταστρέψαι αὐτὰς καὶ πάντως ἐκτιθέασιν ἑαυτοὺς εἰς τὴν κρίσιν παντὸς διὰ τὴν ποιότητα τῆς τε κρίσεως καὶ πράξεως αὐτῶν ταύτης. Τὸ πολὺ δι' ὃ δεῖ καταδικάσαι τοὺς τοῦτο πράξαντας ἐστὶν ἡ μόλυνσις τοῦ περιβάλλοντος! Ἀλλὰ καὶ τότε, διὰ τὴν μεγάλην δημοσιότητα ἣν ἡ πράξις αὕτη ἔλαβε, τὸν δικαστὴν χρὴ ποιεῖν εἰδικὴν καὶ οὐσιώδη ἀναφορὰν εἰς τὴν *αἰτίαν* τῆς πράξεως αὐτῆς τῶν δραστῶν, τουτέστι τὴν τε ποιότητα τοῦ βιβλίου καὶ τὴν *προφανῇ* πρόθεσιν τοῦ συγγραφέως *δημοσίᾳ διὰ τοῦ βιβλίου πειράσαι (provoke) τὸ καλῶς εἰς αὐτὸν γνωστὸν ἐνδείκνυνται μέρος* τῆς κοινῆς γνώμης· οὐπὲρ ἡ *ἀφευκτος δημοσία ἀντίδρασις* εἰς τὴν πρόκλησιν ταύτην ὥφειλε προσδοκᾶσθαι βεβαιότητι παρὰ παντὸς εὐφυοῦς, ἄρα καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ τούτου τοῦ συγγραφέως· ὅστις *προσεπορίσθη* κἂν φερόμενος ὡς *δῆθεν* θιγείς τὸ ὠφέλημα *τῆς δωρεάν* διὰ τοῦ τρόπου αὐτοῦ διαφημίσεως τοῦ βιβλίου! Ἡ εὐφυΐα τοῦ συγγραφέως καὶ ἡ ἀναμφίβολος αὐτοῦ πρόβλεψις τῆς ἀντιδράσεως εἰς τὴν πρόκλησιν, δοθείσης καὶ τῆς ἀναλόγου προτέρας αὐτοῦ πείρας, ἀποδεικνύουσιν αὐτὸν εἰς *εἰδεχθῶς ἠθικὸν αὐτουργὸν* τῆς μόλυνσεως! Ἀναφορικῶς νῦν πρὸς μόνον τὸν συγγραφέα, τοῦτο δεῖ ἐρωτᾶσθαι: Ἀσφαλῶς ἡ ἐλευθερία τοῦ λόγου ἐστὶν ἀπαραβίαστος! Ἀλλὰ δικαιούται ἐχέφρων *ἀναιτίως* ἀναφωνεῖν ἐν θεάτρῳ "φωτιά!", καὶ ὕστερον ἐγείρειν ἀξιώσεις κατὰ τῶν ποδοπατησάντων αὐτόν; Τὸ δικαστήριον οὖν δεῖ ἐπιβάλλειν ποινὰς *μέχρις ἐξαντλήσεως τοῦ νόμου* εἰς *πάντας* τοὺς αὐτουργοὺς, *ἀναλόγους* τῶν διὰ τῶν πράξεων αὐτῶν εἰς αὐτοὺς πορισθέντων ὠφελμάτων καὶ τῶν βλαβῶν τῶν προκληθεισῶν εἰς τὸ κοινωνικὸν σύνολον, καὶ ἀναλόγως βαρείας εἰς *πάντα* τὸ περιβάλλον ῥυπαίνοντα! Ὅτι χλευαζόμεθα καὶ διὰ τὴν *οὐσίᾳ ἀνυπαρκτον καθαριότητα* τῆς χώρας ἡμῶν! Δι' ἣς αὕτη, παρὰ πάσας τὰς ἀξιώσεις, ἀνυποδείκνυται ἀπολίτιστος! Δι' ἣν πάντας τοὺς δικαστὰς χρὴ ἐξαντλεῖν τὴν αὐστηρότητα τοῦ νόμου κατὰ πᾶσαν εὐκαιρίαν διδομένην αὐτοῖς!

ΑΝΤΙΓΡΑΦΑ:

Γενικῶ Εἰσαγγελεῖ Ἀρείου Πάγου,
Προέδρῳ Συμβουλίου Ἐπικρατείας,
Προέδρῳ Δημοκρατίας,
Προέδρῳ Κυβερνήσεως,
Προέδρῳ Βουλῆς,
Ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ Ἀθηνῶν.

ΑΠΟΚΡΙΣΙΣ:

Οὐδεμία, παρ' οὐδενός.

Re: LETTER TO DR. GEORGE BISTIS

Professor George N. Bistis
64 Kline Boulevard
Berkeley Heights, NJ. 07922

September 19, 2000.

(Excerpt)

On Pessimism and Objective Reality

Dear George:

On Wednesday, coming back home, I found waiting your note, mailed Aug. 30th, including the NY Times of Aug. 15, 2000 article on Pessimism. Of all things! At first, I was only bemused! The *sad* amusement came only later, when the desperately convoluted thinking of the relativists (from whose “standpoint” sadly you still attempt to interpret even my view of things) sank in!

In the first place, it is *not* a personal matter, and so *not* a case of *my* winning, but the *most important ever* case of acknowledging Objective Truth! That the professorial caste are *so stubbornly unwilling* to see the matter in this light only shows that they *never* started out from a *burning inborn desire to get to the Objective Truth*, but from a desire of *personal aggrandizement among peers and inferiors*, that *denies* the existence of anything superior, especially of Objective Reality-Truth, that *alone* has the power to cut *all perceived magnitudes* down to size! Barring Objective Reality, *only the self* remains; and as a pole of attraction, only *its* satisfaction! So it is that “relativity” (the *denial* of Objective Truth) was born, and the concomitant notion of “*all points of view (frames of reference) being (thus ‘necessarily’) correct*” was established! So many selves, so many frames! “All correct”; or else, Objective Truth reenters! But especially the professorial self is a particularly demanding beast: That “all points of view are correct” *never really* meant *all*! As that would have denied right from the start the *superior* particular importance of the professorial cast! “All”, but *not all*! *The professorial cast must always be satisfied in the corresponding superior way*—by constant, relentless, even *suppressive of the Truth* “winning”! So, it is particularly hypocritical that professors should now present themselves as lamenting the presence of “winning”, *the most virulent social virus they introduced*—by word, deed and attitude! Now, they have the gall to introduce an “es-

cape” (or “defensive pessimism”, or *how to be satisfied with your lot!*)—*Of course, only* for those others that cannot “win”, *not* for themselves! In the Wild West there was that most respectable class of “hired guns”! Now we have the far more respectable class of “hired professors”! There is nothing they cannot invent, for their pay! That by sitting down by such teachers humanity has reached its present state should not surprise anyone claiming intelligence for himself!

You *know* I am not a relativist! So, *don’t even try* to make me say that I belong in *any such (always relativistic)* category! *Not* sorry!

When a relativist denies the existence of an absolute reference, you *must* agree, there is *no standpoint* he can take! The relativistic self-reference in this world determines *absolutely nothing! Not even itself*, as *even it* is being constantly transformed by the relativistic effect of others! That’s why *no* relativist has a spine worthy of a *man!* And that’s why they don’t react, even when told so in the face! A spine *takes a stand, makes a direction!* Things *unknown* in a relativistic world! In relativity *nothing stands, everything falls—aimlessly!* In relativity, a moving aim is *never certain* it shall be gotten at as it was originally set after! If despite himself, a relativist dislikes himself sinking in *his aimless* abyss, he can only devolve in attempting to keep himself “up” (but *where is up?*) by pulling on his own hair! In modern pseudoscientific parlance, *this very activity* is called “coping strategy”! The great science of psychology (let me not comment any further on it) deals with the *perceived* categories of *just such* “coping”! Like “science”, like strategy!

Careful! I *don’t* deny that people can get psychologically sick! I deny the correctness of the diagnosis! It is *not* life itself that makes people sick, as *only* the relativists assert! It is *only* their *stubborn insistence on regarding their wrong perception of relativity* as part of reality and life, which they have instilled in people’s souls poisoning them, that makes people sick, as they twist spineless in the abyss! Give people bad water, and they *shall* get sick! Give them stale bread, and they *shall* get sick! Why should their souls be any different? Thoughts are the food and drink of souls! Sick thoughts *cannot* make healthy souls! Pure and simple! But things cease to be pure and simple when *new, advanced, undetectable ways of emptying people’s pockets must be found!* For such, trust the hired (O.K., *some*) professors! Whose ways, especially when sugar coated as “positive thinking”, remain *securely undetectable!* So it is that (hired) professors and their pills are perceived as offering a very much needed service to society! Now, having finally exhausted all variations of “optimistic positive thinking”, they turn to “pessimistic *but still positive* thinking” (“defensive pessimism”)—positive being any transference to their and their masters’ pockets, defensive even if indefensible in that they can always devise theories defending that transference, while pessimism is certainly always proper *for their victims!* Trust the hired (O.K., *some*) professors to discover new ways of picking people’s pockets!

There is no question that the expectation of Judgment makes people *very* anxious, especially the guilty! But look: The professors are a *very* select and so a *very* aristocratic sort! So aristocratic in fact that they first of all *must* deny the existence of Judgment to which even they, and as teachers of people they first, *shall* be subject! The “solution” lies in *slandering*, by labeling as “pessimists” those who argue for the *Logical Need* of Judgment, and as “optimists” those dismissing such Need! Judgment smacks of Aristocracy! Even if it be, especially if it be, by the *impartial* absolute measure of God! The “optimistic” abolition of Judgment, thus has the distinct whiff of egalitarian and democratic endorsement, especially of such paragons as the hired (i.e., the *most distinguished*) professors, who thus not only shine supporting “democratic” aspirations but also serve themselves by so effectively hiding the aristocracy of their own class! It *cannot* escape any active conscience that in so doing, the professors *factually* present themselves as an effective, and the *only* “meaningful”, substitute of God! So, George, when you ask whether I regard myself as a defensive pessimist, what exactly do you want me to think of *you*? Can it be that you yourself have given in to so thick a relativism that you truly cannot conceive of Reality *free of all such purely relativistic* categorizations?

Now, is it correct to regard the expectation of Judgment as pessimistic? But first, *how* can it be that so calling the expectation of Judgment is not an *unconscious confession* of having most grievously and *unforgivably* sinned? If the (*mutely denied*) *conscious* confession (whence the *total silence on the proof*), that for the good of us all I demand of “scientists” *having* so grievously sinned against Man and God, is *not* what *they* shall ever offer, how can *they*, how shall *they ever* escape pessimism? So, *unless they (and you with them?) are prepared to call Logic a defect of character*, my *Logical* expectation of the pessimistic outcome of the human race is *not* a philosophical inclination-defect of my character needing “correction”, but only a *Logical* evaluation of the inevitable, based on the *determination* of professors-teachers of men (and all those that *order and support them and follow their “lead”*) *not to change course, even in full view of the coming Judgment, now proven in their face!* When a car going steep downhill loses brakes and steering, is it pessimistic or only *Logical* to expect catastrophe? Don’t you see that remaining optimistic in the circumstance involves the expectation of a *true* miracle, that the relativists and *all* atheists *may not* engage in?

Be not surprised: On my part, *I do regard the expectation of Judgment most optimistically!* *NOT* for my having secured by my own acts the forgiveness of my sins, *far from it*, but for the final *Logical* Establishment of Justice! Who am I to deny that, for the sake of my own petty interests? Yet, if a sinner can elevate himself to subordinating his own interests to those of Justice: in the first place, he is *not* so damnable remaining burningly desirous of *Logical* Justice while conscious of the facts and mindful of his failings that he laboriously works on;

and in the second place, *Logical Justice*, by being *Itself*, *cannot* fail to weigh this stance of his during Judgment! The “forgiveness of sins by the Grace of God” is *not in the least* whimsical, *nor* partial, *nor* unjust! We *do have the power to force*, this way or that, the Hand of God, also known as “Gates of Heaven”! And God *loves this forcing*, if it be for the good! Can you conceive of a sinner condemned to Hell, *yet therefrom ceaselessly and heartily praising* God’s Judgment? Hell then would *not* be *Hell*! It is the *Logical Loving Justice of God* that declares this situation impossible, by forgiving that sinner while keeping inviolable the partition of Heaven and Hell! Coming from such paragons as the learned professors, the pessimistic view of Judgment discloses not just a forgivable ignorance of God, but *deliberate and determined haughty neglect of the Need and Logic* of Judgment; which *proves them taking liberties, and shows them lesser minds than they demand of us to regard them as*! In Reality, there is *no* optimism that does not include *a constant, joyful, quiet celebration* of the *Coming* Judgment, that *from within transforms* man to Man, steels his spine, firms his foot, makes rubbish of *all* professorially introduced psychological crutches, and elevates this Earth to antechamber of Heaven! But *what* do the relativist professors and their “science” know about that?

I know, there are *so-called* Christians! *These are* soft! But who said that *Christians* are, must be, soft? So judging *Christians* only shows one’s own “spiritual” softness! Sorry! I do *not* expect diamond hardness of professors or priests or others engaging in *il*Logical “science”, “love”, or such psychological mumbo jumbo! “Psycho-” comes from psyche = soul. *What* do the relativists and all those that deny the *Logical Spirit know* of soul? To exist at all and be it-self, the soul demands *absolute, secure, Logical orientation and support*! Proper soul searching *and* soothing thus is possible in the field *beyond* relativity! The “good professors” seeking to “heal” souls lost in and by relativity *are fools, or liars*, engaging in futility! I am an engineer! I deal in hard fact, *not* in fiction! It does *not* make me a pessimist (defensive or other), only a *realist*, to state that the Verrazano Bridge *cannot* be built with mud and straw! If it *so* could, and *so* being so very much cheaper, *so* would it have been built! The relativists, *even while on it, depending for their safety on it*, can only answer that this is a matter of opinion (frame of reference)! They never bother to ask how the roof tiles *are securely held* in place! *Their* loss! As for you, George, *what is your* gain?

Friendly,

Re: ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΗ ΚΑΙ ΟΡΘΟΔΟΞΙΑ

(Έπ' ευκαιρία αναφορών κατά τὸ πρόσφατον
Συνέδριον 4-8 Ὀκτωβρίου 2000)

Κύριον Νικόλαον Ἀρτεμιάδην, Πρόεδρον
Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθηνῶν
Πανεπιστημίου, 28
Ἀθήνας, 10679

Νοεμβρίου 3, 2000.

Ἀγαπητὲ Κύριε Πρόεδρε:

Γράφω ὑμῖν ὡς θέσει καταλληλοτέρου ἐγείραι ἔλλογον οὐσιώδη καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ τόπῳ συζήτησιν περὶ τὴν *συνάφειαν* (τινὲς λέγουσιν *ἀνηλεὴ διαμάχην* μεταξὺ) Ἐπιστήμης καὶ Θρησκείας, ἥς ἡ *μέχρι τοῦδε παντελής ἐν αὐτῷ ἔλλειψις* μειζόνως αὐτὸν ζημιῶι, ἢ τὸν λοιπὸν κόσμον ὅπου διὰ τῆς γενικῆς παιδείας καὶ ἀγωγῆς αἰώνων μακρῶν τὰ ἐκεῖ *προσωπικὰ διατρέχοντα* περιορίζετ' ἐντὸς κάλλιον καθωρισμένων πλαισίων καὶ οὐκ ἀνυψοῦτ' εὐκόλως, ὡς παρ' ἡμῖν, εἰς τὸ ἐπίπεδον δημοσίως ὑποστηριζομένων *δῆθεν ἀποδεδειγμένων "κοσμοθεωριῶν"* (ἵνα κάλλιον ἐν αὐταῖς κρύπτηται κάκειθεν τρομοκρατὴ ἀδαεῖς καὶ ἀντιφρονούντας), παρ' ὅτι καὶ ἐκεῖ ἡ μελέτη τῆς συναφείας Ἐπιστήμης καὶ Θρησκείας ἔτι ἐστὶν ἐν σπαργάνοις. Ὅτι ἀνελάβετε δοῦναι τὴν εἰσαγωγικὴν τοῦ συνεδρίου εἰσήγησιν μαρτυρεῖ καὶ τὴν θέσει ὑμετέραν ἀρμοδιότητα καί, ὑποτίθηναι, τὰναμφίβολον προσωπικὸν ὑμῶν ἐνδιαφέρον. Δι' ὃ τολμῶ τόδε διάβημα, ἐπὶ τῇ βεβαιότητι ὅτι ἄντ' ὀχλήσεως μᾶλλον εὐχαρίστησιν προκαλέσει ὑμῖν. Σημειώσατε ὅτι ἡ συνάφεια Ἐπιστήμης καὶ Θρησκείας ἀποτελεῖ τὴν κυρίαν μου *extracurricular activity* ἐπὶ τέσσαρας ὅλας δεκαετίας, ὡς ἐπίσης ὅτι πᾶσα προσπάθειά μου ἐγείραι τὸ *οὐσιαστικὸν* ἐπὶ τοῦ θέματος ἐνδιαφέρον ἐπιστημόνων καὶ θεολόγων προσέκρουσε πάντοτε, τόσον εἰς τὴν ἀλλοδαπὴν ὅσον καὶ τὴν ἡμεδαπὴν, εἰς τὸν *ἀνομολόγητον μέγαν* αὐτῶν φόβον *of the terra incognita on the other side*, οὗ ἕνεκ' ἀμφοτέρω τὰ στρατόπεδ' ἐπιμελῶς ἀποφεύγουσι λαμβάνειν θέσιν, ἐν ᾗ, σημειώσατε, καὶ τῶν *σαφέστατα διαφανεισῶν*, τοῦλάχιστον ἐκ τῶν ἐμῶν μελετῶν, *ἀναγκαίων ἀπαραιτήτων ἀναθεωρήσεων ὡς ἔτι καὶ μειζόνων ἀντιλήψεων κρατουσῶν ἐπ' αἰῶνας μακροῦς* ἐντὸς ἐκάστου τῶν στρατοπέδων κεχωρισμένως!

Ὡς ἐκ τῆς φύσεως τοῦ προβλήματος, αἱ ἀκολουθοῦσαι παρατηρήσεις, χρώμεναι, ὠκοδομημέναι ἐπὶ, καὶ ἐκκινούσαι ἀπὸ τῶν καθαρῶς τεχνικῶν

εὐρημάτων τῶν ἐμῶν μελετῶν, ἄπτονται καὶ γενικωτέρων τινῶν τεχνικῶν, καὶ πολλῶν φιλοσοφικῶν, καὶ τῶν προσωπικῶν ἐκάστου ἡμῶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, *πάντως πασῶν οὐσιωδῶν* πτυχῶν καὶ τῆς Ἐπιστήμης καὶ τῆς Ὁρησκείας, ὁ πλήρης ὧν πτυχῶν διαχωρισμός ἐστι δύσκολος ἢ καὶ φύσει ἀδύνατος. Δι' ὃ ἐπικαλοῦμαι τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀντίληψιν.

A. Πολλὴ ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ 1931 περί, καὶ διὰ, τῶν θεωρημάτων τῶν Gödel καὶ Tarski συζήτησις. Τὰ θεωρήματα ταῦτ' ἀνεπτύχθησαν ἐπὶ *τάναγκαίον* διὰ τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτῶν ἀπεριορίστου συνόλου τῶν φυσικῶν ἀριθμῶν, κατὰ τὴν ἔρευναν τῆς *ἀξιοματικῆς* συνοχῆς τῶν θεμελίων τῆς θεωρητικῆς ἀριθμητικῆς, δεδομένης *μέν* δι' ἀριθμῶν καὶ *τῶν σαφῶν* μεταξὺ αὐτῶν σχέσεων, ὅμως δ' οὐδέποτε πρότερον ἐξετάσας τὴν συνοχὴν τοῦ ἐαυτῆς ὑποβάθρου. Ἡ ἀρχικὴ περὶ τὰ θεωρήματα ταῦτα συζήτησις ἀκολούθως ἐπεξετάθη καὶ τὰ ἐδάφη τῆς λογικῆς ἐφ' ἧς τὰ μαθηματικὰ θεμελιόυται, τῆς χρωμένης αὐτῶν φυσικῆς, ἔτι δὲ καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς φιλοσοφίας (περιλαμβανούσης σιωπηρῶς καὶ τὴν θεολογίαν) ὡς τελικὸν καὶ συνολικὸν πεδίου ἀναφορᾶς. Ἄλλ' ἡ ἐπέκτασις τῶν θεωρημάτων αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ σύνολον τῶν μαθηματικῶν (ἐπὶ τῇ δικαιολογίᾳ ὅτι ταῦτ' ἀποτελεῖ *a closed science*), ἐκείθεν εἰς πᾶν ἄλλο πεδίου χρώμενον μαθηματικῶν ἐννοιῶν, κάκειθεν εἰς τὴν ἑκφρασιν τῆς "incompleteness of axiomatic theories and the indefinability of the concept of truth" συνίστησιν *a veritable huge leap of faith!* Διότι, *προφανῶς*, ὑπάρχει *κολοσσιαία* διαφορὰ μεταξὺ ἀφ' ἑνὸς τοῦ πάντως ἀνοικτοῦ συνόλου τῶν φυσικῶν ἀριθμῶν ἐχόντων μίαν καλῶς ὀργανοῦσαν τούτους διάταξιν (*having a well-ordering relation*) περὶ ὧν μόνων τὰ εὐρήματα Gödel καὶ Tarski, καὶ ἀφ' ἑτέρου *ἀλλοτρίων συνόλων εὗρους* ἔτι ἀκαθορίστου, ὡς ἐστὶ τὸ σύνολον φυσικῶν σύμπαν θεμελιωδῶν σωματιδίων ἔτι ἀγνώστου ἀριθμοῦ, φύσεως καὶ δομῆς διατηρούντων πρὸς ἄλληλα σχέσεις ἐπίσης ἔτι ἀγνώστου φύσεως καὶ δομῆς, καὶ τὰ σύνολα τῆς λογικῆς, φιλοσοφίας καὶ Θεολογίας, ἐν οἷς ἡ ἀριθμητικὴ μικρὸν ἕως μηδενικὸν εὖρος καταλαμβάνει. Ἡ ἐπὶ τῶν πεδίων τούτων ἐφαρμογὴ τῶν θεωρημάτων Gödel καὶ Tarski ἀπλῶς *πιθανολογεῖται!*

Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ συγκρότησις αὐτῆς τῆς θεωρητικῆς ἀριθμητικῆς περιλαμβάνει *ἀναποφεύκτως* πλὴν τῶν ἀριθμῶν καθ' αὐτοὺς καὶ *πρόσθετα στοιχεία καθαρῶτα* ἔξω-ἀριθμητικῆς σημασίας (connective "particles" such as: 'not', 'and', 'or', 'if..., then...', 'if and only if..., then...', other operators; symbols such as: 'equal', 'not equal', 'larger than', 'smaller than'; etc.), ὧν *ἄνευ τὸ νοεῖν* ἀριθμοὺς καὶ ἀριθμητικὴν *ἀδύνατον!* Ἀρκεῖ ἄρ' ὅμως τοῦτο τὰδύνατον ὥστε μεταχειρίζεσθαι τὰ ἔξω-ἀριθμητικὰ ταῦτα στοιχεῖα *in the manner of* Gödel, in axiomatic formalisms and procedures that *arbitrarily turn them into pure numbers* in an attempt to express (and thus "secure"), *purely by numbers*, arguments and conclusions *logically wider than numbers*, even as such arguments and conclusions refer solely to numbers? And what can then be the value of Gödel's conclusions in the largely foreign fields of logic, physics, philosophy and theology? Ἐρωτῶ διότι, *ἀναντιρρήτως*, the arithmetization of such "parti-

cles” as enacted within, *as part and parcel of*, the Gödel procedure ἀποτελεῖ προκαταδεδικασμένην προσπάθειαν ἐκφράσεως τοῦ μείζονος διὰ τοῦ ἀνεπαρκοῦς πρὸς τοῦτο ἐλάσσονος! Πῶς οὖν οὐκ ἐστὶν ἄρα τὰ θεωρήματα τῶν Gödel καὶ Tarski ἀπόδειξις ἀκριβῶς τῆς τοιαύτης ἀδυναμίας, περιέργως πῶς ἐπιτυγχανομένη (εἰ ἀληθής) παρὰ ταῦθαίρετον τῆς μεθόδου;

Συλλογίσθητε τὰκόλουθα: Carefully expressed, Gödel’s first theorem states that “there exist *arithmetic* propositions (even of comparatively elementary nature) that *are evidently true yet cannot be deduced* from within the formalism of arithmetic”. Carefully expressed, Gödel’s second theorem states that “a formula (consisting of axioms and, optionally, additional truths) written in accordance with the rules of the formalism of arithmetic *cannot* be shown to be consistent (i.e., free of hidden contradictions) within said formalism”; or, in other words, that “*arithmetic* cannot prove itself to be free of contradictions”.

To a firm believer in the infallibility of mathematics (especially of arithmetic), these imply the presence of something *definitely wrong* either in the formulation of propositions, or in the method of their use, or in the axioms and other “truths” employed, or in the rules used, or in the structure of Hilbert’s “axiomatic-symbolic logic” formalism (on which Gödel’s procedure is based), or in the nature itself of natural numbers, or in some combination of these. But that the problem lies in the *nature of natural numbers* is indeed unbearable! As there are three distinct schools engaged in laying the new, unshakable yet consistent foundations of mathematics (B. Russell’s “logistic”, D. Hilbert’s “axiomatic”, and L.E.J. Brouwer’s “intuitionist”), but none supplies an entirely satisfactory answer, both the wider problem of their failure to attain their common aim and the specific problem created by the Gödel findings (*neither* shown wrong *nor* verified by the methods of the other two schools) probably lie in our *still incomplete* understanding of the nature of numbers and our faulty appraisal of the limitations posed by our present understanding of numbers on their correct treatment; of which Gödel’s procedure is but an example:

Consider H. Weyl’s¹ choice of the simple formula $1 + x \neq y$, by means of which he “attempt[ed] to describe Gödel’s discovery with as much precision as is possible...”. In the description, the formula was treated as if x and y were *both* variable. But if x be variable, *so is* $1 + x$; and there is *no* way that this sum cannot be set equal to another variable, here named y ! Though the formula $1 + x \neq y$ *seems* legitimate technically, qualitatively it *is* illegitimate, as it in fact states that “what is a variable is not a variable”! But in this specific case, there is more: the formula *contradicts also the recursive nature itself* of number; *secured by its opposite formula* $1 + x = y$, that *is correct in every case in which x and y are consecutive natural numbers*! Yet, neither Gödel [hinting at a theory in which

¹ *The Philosophy of Mathematics and Natural Science*, Atheneum/Princeton Univ. Press, New York, 1963, p.221 et seq.

“every concept is significant everywhere except for certain ‘singular points’... so that the paradoxes appear as something analogous to dividing by zero...”] makes any allowances for such conflicts as just pointed out (that are *not* paradoxes but *logical errors*), nor Weyl takes note (let alone exception) of these exact conflicts (even in a book named *The Philosophy of Mathematics and Natural Science*!

Close examination shows Gödel’s procedure to be so axiomatic as to produce *no* justification of its own method, and his “proof” to depend *entirely* on a highly ingenious yet *contrived* series of remarkable but *arbitrary finite* steps taken in arithmetizing the formalism. Now, axioms are used in theories, and theories need supply no *a priori* justification of the axioms they use. Nevertheless, *all theories, and especially those producing highly unexpected conclusions, depend on subsequent independent practical verification to gain acceptance; and when they are not verified, either their axioms are revised, or the theories are rejected in their entirety.* This does *not* seem to have happened in Gödel’s case; *his findings have in fact been swallowed, though with difficulty yet with resignation!* As if in this unique case, it were allowed for the axiomatic theory to stand for its own proof! Can it be that the axiomatic nature of his procedure together with the abstractness of the field have obscured (or have they excused?) the *fact* that Gödel’s *is just a mathematical (but still a) theory, that must be treated as any other theory before it is accepted?*

Keeping these in mind, let us now *evaluate* the Gödel procedure. Even without a detailed description of it as that by Weyl, *a simple introductory outline of it suffices to persuade* that Gödel’s conception *is a formal mathematical theory depending entirely on its own finite steps.* One such outline has been preceded by this statement: “one of [Gödel’s] results states that ‘any proof that a formal system is free from contradictions necessarily requires methods beyond those provided by the system itself; accordingly one cannot prove that number theory is free from contradictions by means of finite methods in the strict sense’”². It is clear that before a theory may claim application to a wider field *including it* (as here to the entire number theory that contains it), *it must itself satisfy its own conclusions.* But in light of the statement just quoted, *the Gödel procedure concludes denying the validity first of itself and then of its own conclusions!* Finding that “any proof that a formal system is free from contradictions necessarily requires methods beyond those provided by the system itself” *suffices* for concluding that *the formal system made up of the Gödel procedure is not free from contradictions precisely because it fails to use methods beyond those provided by this system itself!* And a failing system does *not* produce valid results! Here then we have *the most remarkable par excellence* situation of the world

² *The VNR Concise Encyclopedia of Mathematics*, W. Gellert et al., Ed., Nan Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1977, p.719.

scientific community *accepting (or at least swallowing) as unquestionably true an assertion* (first about the *rest of arithmetic* and then about the *rest of the world!*) of a theory that *mutely admits* of itself that “*all I state cannot be proved to be true, even this very statement*”; that is just another version of the ancient Epimenidean paradox! A *formal* effort in the hard core of science devised to resolve axiomatically *all* uncertainties (including paradoxes) comes full circle first to admit itself as paradoxical and then to reestablish the ancient paradox as intrinsically irresolvable! The world scientific community *swallows the assertion and honors the theory!*

In the face of which, the world scientific community, respecting itself, *must* take stock of itself!

Another example of faulty understanding comes from the work of Russell, who in the effort to establish mathematics on an unquestionable “logical” basis, resolved to *prove* (by general agreement *unsuccessfully!*) even that $1 + 1 = 2$. He seemed to have *overlooked* that $1 + 1 = 2$, common in all the world, is *not* an equation requiring proof, but the *reversed misstatement of the definition* of 2 as the sum of two units, $2 \equiv 1 + 1$! It is *logical* that what is only defined *cannot* be “proven”, and that as a matter of logic!

So, which of the two are we to conclude? That Reality is intrinsically irresolvable as a matter of its own ontology? Or that even first class mathematicians *are* subject to error (especially in the forefront of research, where alone “problems” appear that are *never* met in the wide field of applied arithmetic, where operative is *not* the theory but the *recursive-definitional* nature of number that *guaranties* the absence of error)? If we opt for the former, *we must give up at once* all further scientific effort to resolve the great unanswered questions! And then take pride in our own “rectitude”—which however *cannot* be guaranteed (except *doubtfully*, by ourselves) in a Reality characterized by its own “*irrectitude*”! The first option *is unable* to save our honor! Which *is saved* by the second option, that moreover allows us to proceed, though with all required circumspection!

Consider now Tarski’s theorem, that in the words of J. Bronowski ³ states that, “there can be no precise language which is universal; every *formal* language which is at least as rich as arithmetic contains meaningful sentences that cannot be asserted to be either true or false”. As there is no language that is richer than arithmetic [Gödel with his procedure of arithmetization, based on the prime numbers of infinite multitude, demonstrated at least that, given some *well-organized* rule, anything, even other than number, *can* be represented by a corresponding characteristic (unique to it) prime number], and as all common languages have their weaknesses, Tarski uses a (now *not* guaranteed but *intrin-*

³ *A Sense of the Future*, The MIT Press, 1977, p.59.

sically suspect) mathematical way to state that the search for Truth is hopeless! IS IT? IF indeed so, the first that *must* close shop are, again, the scientists, led by the theoretical mathematicians, and followed by *all those* that use ordinary speech with some (then *hopelessly contrived*) semblance of truth! IF Gödel and Tarski are right, *we all seemingly serious thinkers and writers of every kind barring none are charlatans!* However unpleasant, this extends even to Theology! So, it is the duty of every self-respecting thinking person to demand, and to the extent of his capacity contribute to, a badly needed debate on the clarification and the ultimate meaning of our *entire* civilization! Doing anything less, and so far *we are doing much less*, is tantamount to *resignation* ἀπὸ τῆς πνευματικῆς ἡμῶν ιδιότητος ἣς μόνῃς ἔνεκα καλούμεθ' ἄνθρωποι!

B. Πρὸ τῆς τοιαύτης ("πιθανῆς" ἔστω) σημασίας τῶν ὡς ἄνω θεωρημάτων καὶ δι' αὐτὴν ταύτην τὴν ἐπιστήμην καὶ δι' ὅλας ἐν γένει τὰς πνευματικὰς τάνθρώπου δραστηριότητας, ἀναγκαία ἡ διερεύνησις ἐνίων συναπτομένων θεμάτων. Κατανοητέον ὅτι τὰ συμπεράσματα τῶν Gödel καὶ Tarski οὐ παρήχθησαν ἐν αἰθρίᾳ. Ἦδη ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχῶν τοῦ αἰῶνος, ἡ ἐργασία τοῦ Russell ἀδυνατήσασα ἐρμηνεύσαι κατὰ λογικὴν τὰ θεμέλια τῆς ἀριθμητικῆς, ἡ "ἐρμηνεία" κατ' Einstein τοῦ πειράματος τῶν Michelson καὶ Morley ἐπ' ἀποδοχῇ τῆς ἀπροσδιοριστίας κατ' Einstein τὰκριβοῦς τόπου καὶ χρόνου τελέσεως τῶν φαινομένων, ἡ εἰσαγωγή τῶν quanta ὑπὸ τοῦ Planck, ἡ "ἐρμηνεία" τῆς δομῆς τοῦ ἀτόμου τοῦ ὑδρογόνου ὑπὸ τοῦ Bohr, ἡ ἀνάπτυξις τῆς κυματομηχανικῆς ὑπὸ τῶν Bohr, Schrödinger καὶ πλήθους πολλῶν ἄλλων, καὶ ἡ εἰσαγωγή τῆς ἀπροσδιοριστίας κατὰ Heisenberg τῶν μικροσκοπικῶν φαινομένων, ἐν ᾧ τῆς δοκουμένης "ἀδυναμίας" τῆς "κλασσικῆς" λεγομένης μηχανικῆς καὶ γενικῶς ἐπιστήμης παρασχεῖν ἱκανὴν ἐρμηνείαν αὐτῶν πάντων κατὰ τὰ μέχρι τότε γνωστά, συναπετέλεσαν τὸ θεαλλῶδες ἐπιστημονικὸν κλίμα ἐν ᾧ εἰργάσθησαν οἱ Gödel καὶ Tarski. Ἐν ᾧ χρόνῳ ἐφαίνετο ὅτι ἡ παλαιὰ τῶν πραγμάτων θεώρησις ἐν σχεδὸν πάσῃ γραμμῇ καὶ δραστηριότητι ἀνετρέπετο, ὡς ὅτι "ᾧφειλεν" ἀνατρέπεσθαι ἵνα καταστῇ δυνατὴ ἡ κατανόησις τῶν καινῶν εὐρημάτων, οὗτοι ἐφάνησαν ὅτι ἀπλῶς ἐγκατέστησαν τὸν ἐν' αὐτὸν "ἀξιωματικὸν-μαθηματικὸν" θεμέλιόν τε καὶ κεφαλαῖον (ὄγκο)-λίθον (headstone and keystone) πάσης γενικῶς ἀποκλίσεως ἀπὸ τῆς "κλασσικῆς" λογικῆς! The resignation already referred to οὐκ ἐστὶν ἄσχετος πρὸς τὸ γενικὸν ἐπιστημονικὸν κλίμα τὸ ἔτι κρατοῦν ἔκτοτε. Ἡ ἡθελημένη ἀπονενοημένη κείμεν διάχυσις τῆς γενικῆς πλέον ἀπροσδιοριστίας κὰς ἄλλα περὶ ὅπου πρότερον ἐκυριάρχουν αὐστηραὶ ὠρισμέναι ἀρχαί, ἦθη καὶ νόμοι, καὶ ἡ γενικὴ πλέον διὰ ταύτης χαλάρωσις τοῦ νοήματος αὐτῆς τῆς ζωῆς εἰσὶν ἀπόρροιαι τῆς ἐλλείψεως παντός (ἵνα μὴ τι περὶ αὐστηροῦ μόνου εἴπωμεν) φιλοσοφικοῦ ἐλέγχου τῶν ἐν κοινωνίᾳ συντελουμένων, περιλαμβανόντων καὶ τὰ εὐρήματα τῶν θεωρητικῶν θετικῶν ἐπιστημῶν. Διὰ τοῦτο, ἀναγκαῖον εὐρῦναι πῶς τὴν παρούσαν συζήτησιν.

Προφανὲς ὅτι *πάσα* θεωρία ἐρειδομένη ἐφ' ὑποθέσεων, *κἂν αὐστηρῶς*

λογική καθ' αὐτήν, ἐξαιρεῖ ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτῆς ἰδίου ἐλέγχου τὰς θεμελίους αὐτῆς ὑπ' αὐτὴν ὑποθέσεις, φύσει ἀδυνατοῦσα ἐξετάσαι αὐτάς! Συνεπῶς, καὶ αὕτη ἡ θεωρησις Gödel οὐ δύνατ' εἶναι καλλίων τῶν ἐφ' ᾧν ἡδράσθη ἀξιωματῶν, χρηζόντων ἄλλην ἐξέτασιν ἀνεξάρτητον! (Παρὰ δὲ τοῦτο καὶ τὴν "σαρωτικὴν" ἐκληφθεῖσαν σπουδαιότητα τῶν εὐρημάτων τῶν Gödel καὶ Tarski οὐδεμία εὐρεία ἐξεδηλώθη ἀπαίτησις οὐδ' ἔστω ἐπιθυμία εἶτ' ἀνεξαρτήτου ἐρεύνης τῶν ὑπ' αὐτὰ ὑποθέσεων, εἶτ' ἐπ' ἄλλων τινῶν ὑποθέσεων ἐξετάσεως τοῦ ὅλου προβλήματος!) Παράδειγμ' ἕτερον, ἡ θεωρία τῆς σχετικότητος: Οὐχὶ διὰ παράλειψιν ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν τοιαύτην ἀδυναμίαν οὔτε ὁ Einstein οὔτε ποτέ τις ἕτερος ἐξήτασεν οὐδέ πως ἀπέδειξε τὴν θεμελιώδη τῆς θεωρίας ταύτης ὑπόθεσιν τῆς σταθερότητος τῆς ταχύτητος τοῦ φωτὸς ὑπὸ τὸ "φῶς" αὐτῆς ταύτης τῆς θεωρίας αὐτῆς καὶ τῶν εὐρημάτων 'της! 'Ακόμη καὶ ὅτ' "ἀνεκαλύφθησαν" αἱ **black holes**, "οὐδόλως ἐπηρεάζουσιν" μὲν τὰ ἐν αὐταῖς συντελούμενα παραμένοντα ὡς πιστεύεται ἐν παντὶ ταῦτα ὡς τὰ ὑπὸ τοὺς παρ' ἡμῖν νόμους, δεσμεύουσιν δ' ὅμως τὸ φῶς διὰ τῆς δῆθεν διαστολῆς τοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρίων αὐτῶν χωροχρόνου· παρὰ τὴν προφάνειαν τῆς ἀδιαμφισβητήτου ἀληθείας ὅτι ταχύτης σταθερὰ **over distance** ἀπαιτεῖ ἀπόλυτον σταθερότητα καὶ τῆς τοῦ χρόνου ῥοῆς (παραμενούσης ἀπολύτως ἀσυζητήτου ἐν τῷ πλαισίῳ τῆς θεωρίας) καὶ τῆς διανομένης ἀποστάσεως (ἀπολλυμένης εἰς πᾶσαν περίπτωσιν καὶ τοπικῆς ἔστω διαστολῆς ἢ συστολῆς τοῦ μέσου)!

Γενικῇ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀπροθυμία ἐξετάσεως τῆς ἀληθείας τῶν ὑποθέσεων ἐφ' ᾧν ἐδράζονται αἱ κρατοῦσαι καὶ τιμώμεναι θεωρίαι! Ὡς δ' ὁ χρόνος παρέρχεται καὶ μειζόνως αὐξάνονται οἱ ἐπὶ θεωριῶν οἰκοδομοῦντες σταδιοδρομίας, τοσούτω σκληρύνεται ἡ ἀπροθυμία αὐτὴ καὶ γίνεται ἄρνησις! "Ὅπερ οὐδόλως ἐκφεύγει τῆς προσοχῆς τῶν ὑπηρετούντων αὐτάς, ὅφ' οὗ κατατρύχονται! Διὰ τοῦτο, πάντα τὰ πρὸς ἐπίρρυσίν τινος θεωρίας λεγόμενα, αὐστηρῶς εἰπεῖν, οὐκ ἐστὶν εὐρήματα, δηλαδὴ οὐκ ἐστὶ *facts* τῆς ἐφηρμοσμένης ἐρεύνης, ἀλλὰ μόνον καθαραὶ κατεσκευασμέναι συναγωγαὶ ἐρειδόμεναι ἐπὶ προσθέτων (ἐνίοτε σιωπηρῶν, διαφευγουσῶν ἢ κάνομολογήτων) *ad hoc* ὑποθέσεων *attached to observations and measurements* βοηθουσῶν εἰς τὴν "ἀνακάλυψιν" φυσικῶν "εὐρημάτων" ὑπὸ τῆς θεωρίας ταύτης μόνης δῆθεν προβλεπομένων, ἐπὶ τάνομολογήτῳ σκοπῷ ἐπιρρώσεως ταύτης! Μὴ λησμονώμεν, π.χ., ὅτι τὰ περὶ **black holes** λέγετ' εἰς ἐπίρρυσιν τῆς θεωρίας τῆς σχετικότητος, παρ' ὅτι αὐτὸ τοῦτο τὸ σύμπαν κατὰ τὴν στιγμὴν τῆς γενέσεώς 'του, παρὰ τὸ στιγμιαίον ἄπειρον τῆς τιμῆς τοῦ δυναμικοῦ βαρύτητος, οὐδόλως ἐνεπόδισε τὴν ἔκλυσιν εἴτε τοῦ πρώτου φωτός (ὃ καὶ οὐκ ἦν ἂν τότε δυνατόν ἐκλυθῆναι, εἰ τὸ σύμπαν, ἀποτελοῦν τότε ἀφείκτως *the ultimate though instant white hole*, acted at all as the *much lesser* subsequent **black holes** whose existence is supposedly supported by the theory of relativity, καὶ οὐκ ἐδύνατο τότε ἐκλυθῆναι ὑπὸ τὴν παρούσαν τούτου ταχύτητα!) εἴτε τῶν λοιπῶν ἐκεῖν ἀκολουθησάντων. Ὁ ἰσχυρισμὸς ὅτι ἥσσαντες ὕστεραι **black holes** δύνανται ποιεῖν ὅ,τι ἡ μείζων ἀρχικὴ *white hole* οὐκ ἐδυνήθη ποιῆσαι ἐστὶ καταγέλαστος, ὡς ὡσαύτως ἐστὶν ὁ ἰσχυρισμὸς τῆς σταθερότητος τῆς ταχύτητος τοῦ φωτός, ἐφ' ἧς ἐδράζεται καὶ ἡ ὅλη θεωρία καὶ ἡ ἐκ ταύτης

ἔτι πιστευομένη ἀπροσδιοριστία τὰκριβοῦς τόπου καὶ χρόνου τῶν φυσικῶν φαινομένων, καθ' ἣν στιγμὴν τὸ σημεῖον γενέσεως τοῦ σύμπαντος, ὃν καὶ κέντρον μηδενισμοῦ τῶν ἀρχικῶν (καὶ πάντων ἔκτοτε τῶν) ἀνυσμάτων ταχύτητος καὶ ῥοπῆς, συνίστησι σταθερὸν καὶ ἀπόλυτον σημεῖον-κέντρον ἀναφορᾶς τῶν συντεταγμένων τόπου καὶ χρόνου· διαχωρίζον προσέτι ἀπολύτως τὴν διαστολὴν τοῦ ὄγκου τοῦ σύμπαντος ἀπὸ τῆς λεγομένης διαστολῆς τοῦ περιέχοντος αὐτὸ χώρου, περὶ ἧς ἀπολύτως οὐδὲν ἔξεστι λέγεσθαι, καθ' ὅτι οὐχ οὗτος παρατηρεῖται ἀλλὰ τὸ τούτου περιεχόμενον! Συνεπῶς, "the indefinability of the concept of truth" ἀναφορικῶς πρὸς τὸ σύμπαν, τὸν ῥόλον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν καθολικὴν ἀντίληψιν τῶν πραγμάτων, καὶ τὴν ὅλην πραγματικότητα ἐσφαλμένως ἀποδίδετ' εἰς τὰ δῆθεν ἀληθῆ εὐρήματα τῶν Gödel, Tarski καὶ Einstein, καὶ οὐκ ἀποτιμᾶται, ὥς ἔδει, ὥς ἔλλειμμα αὐτῆς ταύτης εἴτε τῆς μιᾶς δῆθεν "μαθηματικῆς" εἴτε καὶ τῆς ἐτέρας δῆθεν "φυσικῆς" θεωρίας!

Ἀναφέρονται τάνωτέρω οὐχ ὥς ὅτι οὐδὲν τοιοῦτον πρότερον ἐγεγόνει κατὰ τὴν ἐξέλιξιν τῆς συγχρόνου ἐπιστήμης, ἐν ἣ πολλὰ (ἡθελήμεναι) παρανοήσεις εἰσέφρηκαν, ἀλλ' ὥς ἴσως τὰ μείζονα μέχρι τοῦδ' εἰς αὐτὴν παρεισφρήσαντα. Διότι ἤδη ἀπὸ τῆς διὰ πειραμάτων ἀνακαλύψεως τῶν ἀρχῶν διατηρήσεως τῆς μάζης καὶ ἐνεργείας, οὐδόλως κατενοήθη ἐν πάσῃ τῇ αὐτοῦ αὐστηρότητι ὅτι ὥς πᾶσα συναγωγὴ ἐκ πειράματος ὑπόκειτ' ἀφεύκτως τοῖς ὅροις αὐτοῦ, ἄρα χρὴ τοὺς ὅρους δηλοῦσθαι μετὰ τῆς συναγωγῆς! Ἀπὸ τῆς κοινῶς πλέον ἀποδεδειγμένης ὥς δῆθεν "πειραματικῶς ἀποδεδειγμένης" ἀρχῆς ὅτι mass [energy] "is" neither reduced to, nor made up from, nothing ἕως τῆς διὰ τῆς δηλώσεως ταύτης ὑποβαλλομένης ὥς ὀρθῆς κατ' ἐπιστήμην συναγωγῆς ὅτι whereas mass [energy] is incapable of ex nihilo generation, and whereas mass [energy] now exists, therefore it *must* be concluded that mass [energy] has an *infinite* past existence, ἡ ἀπόστασις ἐστὶν ἀγεφύρωτος! Διότι τὸ πείραμα καὶ ἡ παρατήρησις οὐδέποτε περιέλαβον τᾶπειρον παρελθόν, ὥς ἀφεύκτως ὑπονοεῖται δι' ἐκεῖνου τοῦ ὀντολογικῶς-ὑπαρκτικῶς *unqualified* "is"! Τὰκριβὲς πειραματικὸν εὐρημα ἦν ὅτι "as it is *now* observed, under the present limitations of experiment, mass [energy] is neither reduced to, nor made up from, nothing"! Τὰπὸ τῆς προσεκτικῆς ταύτης δηλώσεως τοῦ εὐρήματος ἕως τῆς ὥς ἄνω ὑποβαλλομένης συναγωγῆς γενόμενον ἄλμα οὐκ ἦν ἀμελητέον, ἀθῶον, ἢ πως ἀθέλητον! Σαφὴ γάρ καὶ συγκεκριμένον φιλοσοφικὸν σκοπὸν ὑπηρετεῖ! Τὴν θεμελίωσιν ὥς δῆθεν "ἐπιστημονικῶς ἀποδεδειγμένης" τῆς ἀειπαρξίας (τοῦ αἰδίου) τῆς ὕλης, καὶ τῆς ἀνυπαρξίας τοῦ Θεοῦ! Ἡ ἀπλούστευσις τῆς ἐκφράσεως ὑπέκρυψε καὶ τὸ πρόβλημα τῶν ὁρίων τοῦ πειράματος, καὶ τάνεπίτρεπτον τοῦ τιθέναι τὴν κοινῶς ἀποδεκτὴν ἔκφρασιν ὥς ὑπόθεσιν-θεώρημα-ἀρχὴν περαιτέρω συναγωγῶν, καὶ ἐν τέλει τὴν πρόθεσιν τῆς ὅλης προσπάθειας, ἔτι συνεχιζομένης ἐπὶ τὴν κατασκευὴν μιᾶς "theory of everything", ἐδραζομένης καὶ ἐπὶ πάντων τῶν ὥς ἄνω συζητηθέντων καὶ σκοπούσης ὡμολογημένως εἰς τὸ καταδείξαι "περιττὸν" τὸν Θεόν!

Ἀποτελεῖ μέγα λογικὸν μειονέκτημα πασῶν τῶν ἐπιστημῶν (κυρίως ὁ-

μως τῶν θετικῶν) ὅτι οὐδόλως ἐνοχλοῦνται οἱ ταύτας ὑπηρετοῦντες ἐκ τῆς παντελοῦς ἀπουσίας εἰς τὰς οἰκείας δημοσιεύσεις πλήρους καταλόγου τῶν προτέρων ὑπονοουμένων καὶ τῶν νέων προσγιγνομένων ὑποθέσεων ὁμοῦ μετ' ἐκτιμήσεως τῆς πιθανότητος ἀληθείας ἐκάστης αὐτῶν, ὡς καὶ πλήρους καταλόγου τοῦλάχιστον τῶν κυρίων χαρακτηριστικῶν τοῦ πεδίου ἐφαρμογῆς τῆς ὑπ' ἐξέτασιν θεωρίας ὁμοῦ μετ' ἀποτιμήσεως τῆς ἀβιάστου ἱκανοποίησεως-ἀνευρέσεως-βεβαιώσεως ἐκάστου αὐτῶν δι' αὐτῆς! Προφανές τὰδύνατον τοῦ ἐπιτυχᾶν μίαν ἀκριβῆ *global overview* θεωρίας τινός, πάντων αὐτῶν ἐλλειπόντων! Ἀντιλαμβάνεσθε τὴν ἀπότομον προσγείωσιν τῶν διαβιούντων ἐν νεφέλαις θεωριῶν διὰ τῆς κατανοήσεως τῆς σημασίας τοῦ $(1/2)^5 = 1/32$, δηλοῦντος τὴν πιθανότητα ἀληθείας θεωρίας τινὸς ἐρειδομένης ἐπὶ μόνον πέντε (ὅς ἐστι μικρὸς ἀριθμός!) ὑποθέσεων (πασῶν ἀπαραιτήτων) ἐκάστη τῶν ὁποίων κέκτεται πιθανότητα ἀληθείας $1/2!$ [Σημειωθῆτω ὅτι πέντε παρ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Einstein ἐγένοντο πρόσθετοι *ad hoc* ὑποθέσεις ἵνα καταστή δυνατὴ ἡ διὰ τῆς γενικῆς αὐτοῦ θεωρίας "παραγωγή" of "Newton's theory as a first approximation" [sic]! Τοῦλάχιστον ἴσος δ' ἔσται ὁ ἀριθμός, ἂν λεπτομερῶς μετρηθῇ, πασῶν τῶν ἀνερευνητῶν καὶ ἀρ' ὑπόπτων προηγηθεισῶν ὑποθέσεων ἐφ' ὧν ἐδομήθη ἡ ὅλη θεωρία τῆς σχετικότητος καθ' αὐτὴν, κατορθώσασα (μετὰ μάλιστα μείζονος κόπου καὶ κατὰ μίαν ἐκάστοτε μόνην κατεύθυνσιν δι' ἐν μόνον σῶμα, κατὰ τὸ παράδειγμα τοῦ ἐπιταχυνομένου κλωβοῦ) "ὁμοιάσαι" πρὸς τὴν ἐν τῇ φύσει βαρύτητα (λειτουργοῦσαν πρὸς πάσας τὰς κατευθύνσεις διὰ πάντα τὰ σώματα ταυτοχρόνως)! Πάντες ἀντιλαμβάνονται τὴν σημασίαν πιθανότητος ἴσης (εἰ οὐ μάλιστα ἥσσονος) πρὸς $(1/2)^{10} = 1/1024!$ Πλὴν πάντα ταῦτα ἀποσιωπῶνται!]

Γ. Ἐὰν δεχθῶμεν τὴν ἐφαρμογὴν τῆς θεωρήσεως Gödel εἰς τὰ τῶν φυσικῶν ἐπιστημῶν, τί δεῖ ἡμᾶς λέγειν περὶ τῆς ἀληθείας τῆς συνόλου ἀξιωματικῆς θετικῆς ἐπιστήμης, διὰ τῆς ἐφαρμογῆς τῆς θεωρήσεως ταύτης ἀνταποδεικνυμένης ἀμφιβόλως "ἀληθοῦς"; "Ὅτι περίπου (ἢ ἔστω, ὡς ἔγγιστα) ἀληθεῖς αἱ συναγωγαὶ αὐτῆς περὶ μικρῶν συστημάτων (ὡς ὧν καθημερινῶς χρώμεθα) καὶ ὅλως ἀμφιβολοὶ περὶ μεγάλων; Πῶς οὐ διασπᾷ τοῦτο τὴν ὅλην συνοχὴν τῆς θετικῆς ἐπιστήμης; Πῶς οὐκ αἶρει τοῦτο τὴν συνοχὴν τε καὶ σημασίαν αὐτοῦ τοῦ συνόλου φυσικοῦ σύμπαντος; Ἄν δ' αὕτη αἶρηται, πῶς οὐκ αἶρεται, διὰ στόματος δὲ τῆς ἀξιωματικῆς θετικῆς ἐπιστήμης, ἡ σημασία καὶ τῶν ἡσσόνων ἐν αὐτῷ συστημάτων (ὀργανικῶς πρὸς τὸ ὅλον συνδεδεμένων διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν γε πανταχοῦ νόμων), μεταξὺ ὧν καὶ ἡμεῖς γ' αὐτοὶ καὶ τὰ παρ' ἡμῶν παραγόμενα ἐπιστημονικὰ συμπεράσματα; Ἔστι πῶς δυνατόν ἀμφιβόλως βεβαιοῦν ὡς ἀληθές τὸ ἀμφίβολον; Τί ἐβεβαίωσεν ὁ Ἐπιμενίδης ὁ Κρής καλέσας ψεύστας πάντας τοὺς Κρήτας; A prankster's joke in the mouth of a supposedly seriously talking scientist becomes charlatanism! Ἄλλ' ὁ Ἐπιμενίδης οὐκ ἡσטיεύετο! Ἀπλῶς ἐδήλου τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ἀποκλειομένης ἀντιφάσεως (principle of the excluded contradiction), τάνόητον τοῦ δέχεσθαι καὶ τι καὶ τὸ τούτου ἀντίθετον! Σύνεδρός τις ἐξανέστη ὅθ' ἕτερος σύνεδρος ἐπεκαλέσθη τὸν P. K. Feyerabend, οὐχὶ ἀδίκως βάλλοντα δριμύτα-

τα κατ' ἐπιστημόνων ἐφευρισκόντων *fuzzy theories* ὅλως ἀμφιβόλου ποιότητος καὶ ἐμμενόντων ὅτι δι' αὐτῶν ἀληθῆ λέγουσιν [ὡς π.χ., ὁ Einstein, ὃς παριδὼν τὰ δύναντον, ὅπερ διὰ τῆς θεωρίας 'του σιωπηρῶς ὑπεστήριζε, τοῦ ἀκριβῶς τιθέναι τι ποῦ πότε, οὐπερ συντρέχοντος ἀδύνατος ἐστὶ πᾶσα δημιουργία, εἶπεν ὅτι ἀναμφιβόλως ἔσφαλεν ὁ Θεός, εἰ ἄλλην τῆς σχετικότητος ἐπέλεξε θεωρίαν ἐν τῷ κατασκευάσει τὸν κόσμον]! Ἀλλὰ πάντως, καὶ παρὰ τὰ ἀναμφιβόλως ἐνιαῖον τῶν φυσικῶν νόμων ἐν παντὶ τῷ σύμπαντι (ἐφ' οὗ ὁ Γ. Κοντόπουλος αὐθις διεβεβαίωσε τοὺς συνέδρους), ἐὰν ὁ Gödel ἢ ἐν (γενικῶ καὶ περὶ τῶν φυσικῶν, οὐ δὲ περὶ μόνων τῶν μαθηματικῶν πραγμάτων) δικαίῳ, οὕτω καὶ ὁ Feyerabend! Τοῦτο φυγεῖν ἀδύνατον! Ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ τὰ κατὰ Gödel ἐστὶ γενικῶς ἀληθῆ κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ μέτρον ἢ διὰ μακρῶν ἐτῶν καὶ φοβεροῦ κόπου προσπάθεια τοῦ (ἀθέου αὐτοδηλουμένου) S. Hawking [θεωροῦντος τὰ τῆς σχετικότητος καὶ τῆς νῦν ἀποδεκτῆς κβαντομηχανικῆς ἀρκούντως ἀκριβῆ ὥστ' ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἐπιχειρεῖν θεμελιῶσαι a "believable" theory of everything] ἀναιρέσεως τῆς ἀνάγκης Δημιουργοῦ ἔσεται ἀξιωματικῶς -θεωρηματικῶς κατὰ Gödel προκαταδεδικασμένη ἤδη ἀπὸ τοῦ 1931, καὶ ἔτι στεφθῇ ὑπ' "ἐπιτυχίας"! Ἐπὶ τίνος ἢ τίνων οὖν δικαίως ἐπιπίπτει ἡ κατηγορία τῆς ἀγυρτείας; Οἱ περὶ τὰς θετικὰς ἐπιστήμας ἀσχολούμενοι, ὑπόλογοι ὄντες, ὀφείλομεν ἀποφασίσει τὸ ζήτημα! After all, much public money, not ours, is being spent in such researches, that could be spent elsewhere much more effectively!

Ἄλλ' ἐὰν παρὰ ταῦτα πάντα, διότι what is good for the goose is good for the gander, ἐπιτραπῇ ἡ ἐφαρμογὴ τῆς θεωρήσεως Gödel εἰς τὰ τῶν φυσικῶν ἐπιστημῶν, ἔστιν ἄρα ἐπιτρεπτὴ ἡ ἐφαρμογὴ αὐτῆς ἐπὶ τοῦ συνολικοῦ φυσικοῦ σύμπαντος ὡς ἀξιωματικοῦ κατασκευάσματος, δι' ἧς ὡσαύτως ἐπιχειρεῖται τίθεσθ' ἐν ἀμφιβόλῳ τὴν τούτου περὶ τοῦ Δημιουργοῦ αὐτοῦ μαρτυρίαν; Τί ἐροῦμεν; Ὅτι οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀξιωματικῶς κατασκευασμένον τὸ σύμπαν; Εἰ οὕτω, πῶς εἰς κόσμον, οὐκ ἀπερίγραπτον ἄνομον χάος, τοῦτο συνέρχεται νόμῳ διαπεπιστωμένῳ ἀπ' ἐντὸς τῶν ἀτόμων ἕως περάτων; Εἰ οὕτω, πῶς οὐ συγκρούονται ἀλλήλοις ἀλλ' ἐπιβάλλονθ' ὁμογενῶς, φίλοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους, οἱ φυσικοὶ νόμοι; Εἰ οὕτω, πῶς εὐγενὴς ἀσχολία κοῦκ ἀπάτη αἰσχροῦ ἐστὶ πᾶσα ἡ ἐπιστήμη; Δεῖ ἡμᾶς ἀπαντᾶν! Ἐξήρκεσεν ἡ σιωπὴ!

Δ. Πῶς τοῦλάχιστον ἡμεῖς, οἱ ἐν τῇδε πόλει τῆς μετ' ἐμφάσεως δηλουμένης Θείας Νοήσεως [Ἄ Θεοῦ Νόησις → Ἄ Θεοῦ Νόη → Ἀθῆναι: δι' ὃ μόνον αὕτη καὶ Πόλις Σοφίας ἐκλήθη, οὗ γε διὰ τὴν διαπεπιστωμένην ἀμφίβολον σοφίαν τῶν αὐτῆς πολιτῶν!] κατοικοῦντες, ἄρ' ἀρνησόμεθα καὶ τὸν Πλάτωνα καὶ τὴν παρ' αὐτοῦ τῇ πόλει προσγεγεννημένην τιμὴν, καὶ φοβούμενοι τοὺς ποικιλομόρφους ἀφρόνως καταπίπτοντας ἐπὶ τὸ μηδὲν τὸ ἀπόλυτον φευξόμεθ' ἀπὸ τῆς καθαρῶς ἐλληνικῆς προκλήσεως ἐπὶ τὰ καθαρὰ ὕψη; Πῶς ὁμιλοῦντες περὶ Θεοῦ ἀποφεύγομεν αἰεὶ καθαρὸν τὸν λόγον ποιεῖν, ὥστ' ἀπὸ πάσης βλασφημίας φεύγειν μακράν; Ὡς γὰρ ἐπληθύνθησαν σφόδρα οἱ οὐ μόνον ἐπὶ ματαίῳ ἀλλὰ κάπονενομένη βλασφημίᾳ λαμβάνοντες τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ, διατὶ οὐ καταγγέλλομεν τοὺς πονηρῶς ἐπικαλουμένους

αυτό; Κατανοούμεν ὅτι οὐ τὸ αὐτὸ πάντες ἐννοοῦσι διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος; Ἡ μήπως ἄρα, *σιωπηρῶς μετεβλήθη* ἡ σημασία αὐτοῦ, διότι *ἡμβλύνη* ἡμῶν ἢ τε πίστις καὶ ἡ διάκρισις, δι' ὃ καὶ *ἀδιαφοροῦμεν* δι' ὅσα λέγομεν καὶ ἀκούομεν;

Μετὰ *φαινομένης εὐλαβείας* ἔνθεοί τε καὶ ἄθεοι χρήσιν ποιοῦσι τοῦ Θεοῦ ὀνόματος! Πῶς ὅμως ἡμεῖς διακρινοῦμεν τὸ *διάφορον καὶ διαφόρως νοούμενον ὑποκείμενον* τοῦ ὀνόματος; Δῆλον ὅτι ἄλλος ἦν ὁ τῶν Ἑλλήνων Θεός, ἄλλος ὁ τοῦ Einstein καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων αὐτῶ, καὶ ἄλλος φεῦ ὁ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, παρὰ τὰ καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ λεγόμενα! Ὁ τῶν Ἑλλήνων Θεὸς οὐ μόνον ἦν Πνεῦμα, ἀλλὰ καὶ *Λόγος*, καὶ ἄρα καὶ Πρόσωπον Ζῶν! Δι' αὐτὸ ἦν παρ' αὐτοῖς βαρυτάτη πᾶσα κατ' Αὐτοῦ ὕβρις! Ὁ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, παρὰ τὰ λεγόμενα, *οὐδέποτε* ἐλατρεύθη καὶ ὡς ὁ Λόγος! Ὅτι καὶ Λόγος ὁ Χριστὸς λέγεται *οὐκ* ἀρκεῖ! Ὅτι λέγομεν τὸν Θεὸν πάντα ἐν σοφίᾳ ποιήσαντα *οὐκ* ἀρκεῖ! Διότι καὶ τοιαῦτα ἐπ' αἰῶνας μακροῦς λίαν λέγομεν καὶ *οὐδόλως κατανοούμεν τί Λογικῶς προηγήθη* ἵν' ἐκτελεσθῇ, π.χ., ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ *ἐλλόγῳ λόγῳ δοθεῖσα* ἵνα γένηται φῶς! Καὶ ἡμεῖς δίδομεν ἐντολὴν ἵνα γένηται φῶς, καὶ τις στρέφει τὸν διακόπτην! Ἀλλὰ τίς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὄντως γινώσκει τί *ἀληθῶς* ἐστὶ φῶς; Ὅτι ἡμῶν μὴ γινωσκόντων ὅμως λεγόντων γίγνεται φῶς, οὐδόλως σημαίνει ὅτι ταῦτ' συνέβη καὶ ὅτε ὁ Θεὸς τὴν ἐντολὴν ἔδωκεν! Εἰ οὐ προεῖργαστο Κεῖνος, καὶ οὐκ ἐσχεδιάζει *καταλεπτῶς*, καὶ οὐκ ἀπεπέφαστο, οὐκ ἐδύνατο ἂν τι εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἐλθεῖν! Ὡστε τὰ Λόγως λεγόμενα περὶ κόσμου ἀπ' ἐντὸς αὐτῆς ταύτης τῆς ἐπιστήμης μόνον κατ' ὕβριν ἔξεστιν, ὅπερ οὐκ ἔξεστιν, ἀδιαφόρους τοὺς Θεολόγους καὶ τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ποιεῖν! Ὡς κατὰ τὴν Θεολογίαν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν κόσμον ἐποίησεν, ἄρα Θεολογία ὄντως ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ ἀληθὴς τρόπος τῆς φύσεως, καὶ ἡ ἀληθὴς ἐπιστήμη τῆς φύσεως ἡ σπουδάζουσα τὰς κατασκευὰς τοῦ Θεοῦ! Καὶ *βαθεῖα Θεολογία* ἐστὶν ἡ σπουδὴ καὶ ἡ ἔρευνα τῆς *ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὀρισθείσης συντάξεως ὑπὸ νόμους πάντων*, ὡς καὶ τῶν ὑλικῶν (καὶ τῶν ἰδιοτήτων αὐτῶν) ἐξ ὧν τὸ σύμπαν συντίθεται! Ταῦτ' ἀναπόφευκτα, ὡς ὅτι τὸν Θεὸν λέγομεν τοῦ Κόσμου Δημιουργόν!

Ἄλλ' οἱ ἄθεοι διατείνονται ὅτι οὐχ ὑπάρχει Θεὸς ὡς Πνεῦμα, Λόγος, Πρόσωπον Ζῶν· ὅτι εἰ οὐχ ὅλως τυχαῖα τὰ ὄντα ἐστίν, εἴ ἐστὶ πως Θεός, οὐδεὶς ἄλλος οὗτος τοῦ φυσικοῦ ὑλικοῦ σύμπαντος! Κατ' αὐτοὺς, καὶ *οὐδεὶς* εἴργασται παραγαγεῖν τοὺς νόμους καὶ τὴν ὕλην τοῦ σύμπαντος καὶ *οὐδεὶς* ὑπάρχει ἐκεῖ ἔξω νόμος· ὁ δὲ "νόμος" ὥσπερ "ἀνακαλύπτεται", οὐδόλως *ἀνακαλύπτεται προϋπάρχων*, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον *ἐφευρίσκεται* παρ' ἀνθρώπων, ὡς ἐποικοδόμημα τῆς τοῦ ἐγκεφάλου δομῆς· ἢ δ' ἀνόργανος ὕλη αὕτη μόνη καὶ ὅλως ἀναισθητός ἐστιν, ἐρχομένη εἰς αἴσθησιν μόνον ὅτε συνέρχεται ἐν ζῶσιν ὁργανοῖς ζώντων "πλασμάτων" *τυχαίως ἀνευ τινὸς Πλάστον* πλασθέντων. Ὅτι καὶ ἡ τοιαύτη περὶ κόσμου ἀντίληψις οὐκ ἀφαιρεῖ τὸ θρησκευτικὸν δέος ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος τῶν ἀθέων οὐδόλως καθίστησι τούτους "πιστοὺς" (εἰς Θεὸν-Πνεῦμα-Πρόσωπον-Λόγον) ὡς τινες *συγκρητιστικῶς* διατείνονται "ἀγαπητικῶς" προσπαθοῦντες μετὰ τῶν πιστῶν εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν ἕνα χυλὸν ἐντάξει καὶ τοὺς ἀπίστους, ἵν' ἀγαπητοὶ καὶ αὐτοῖς μένωσιν! Ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ τὸ ψεῦδος *οὔτε συγκρητιστικῶς* δύνανται ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό!

Πᾶσα τοιαύτη προσπάθεια οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ, κἂν δι' "ἀγάπην", ὡς λέγεται, γίνηται. *Πᾶσα σύγχυσις ἀληθείας καὶ ψεύδους ἐκ τοῦ ποιηροῦ*, κἂν συγκατανεύσιν ἐπὶ ταύτην χρυσοποίκιλτ' ἀρχιερεῖς!

Οὕτως, εἴτε οἱ πιστοὶ μόνοι, εἴτε οἱ ἄπιστοι μόνοι ἐν δικαίῳ εὐρίσκονται! Καὶ *δυνάμεθα διὰ παντὸς ἀποφαίνεσθαι περὶ τούτου*, ἐρωτώντες περὶ τῆς ὑπάρξεως Νόμου ἐν τῷ φυσικῷ κόσμῳ! Ὁ Νόμος τῆς φύσεως εὐρίσκεται ἐν ταύτῃ *ἀνεξαρτήτως* τοῦ νοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Πολὺ πρὸ τοῦ ἐμφανισθῆναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ γινώσκουμεν τὸν Νόμον ἐν αὐτῷ λειτουργοῦντα. "Ἄρα *γελοῖον* τὸ ἐμμένειν ἐπὶ τῷ λέγειν τὸν νόμον τᾶνθρώπου ἐφεύρημα! Τὸ οὐσιῶδες ἄρα ἐρώτημα ἐστὶ τούτο: Τοῦ Νόμου ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ὑπάρχοντος, *ποῦ* ἐστὶ τούτου ὁ νομοθέτης; Σημειώσατε ὅτι *καὶ οἱ ἄθεοι συνομολογοῦσι νοητικὸν κατασκευάσμα* τὸν ὃν δοκοῦσιν ὡς νόμον τῆς φύσεως, ὡς ὅτι ἄλλως οὐκ ἂν ἔλεγον τούτον ἐφεύρημα τοῦ νοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων! "Ἄρα *τοῦ Νόμου μὴ ὄντος ἐφευρήματος ἡμετέρου*, ἄλλον δεῖ *ἡμᾶς ἀναζητῆσαι* *Νοῦν οὐ οὗτός ἐστι προῖόν!* Εἰ οὖν ὁ Νοῦς οὐκ ἐστὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν πιστῶν, ἀλλ' ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ Κόσμῳ, *ἐκεῖ δεῖ ἡμᾶς ἀναζητῆσαι αὐτόν!* *Ποῦ* ὅμως ἐστὶ τὸ νοητικὸν κέντρον τοῦ σύμπαντος; Ὑποχρέωσις ἐστὶ τῶν *ἀπίστων* δεῖξαι ἡμῖν τὸ νοητικὸν κέντρον τοῦ φυσικοῦ σύμπαντος, *ὃ ἐν αὐτῷ δεῖ ὑπάρχειν τοῦ Θεοῦ μὴ ὑπάρχοντος!* Τούτων ἀδυνατούντων τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, καὶ τοῦ Νόμου ὑφισταμένου, *μόνη Λογικὴ ἀπομένουσα ἐκδοχὴ* ἐστὶν αὕτη τῶν πιστῶν ὁμολογούντων Καθαρὸν Πνεῦμα τὸν Λόγον! Καί γε νῦν *ἔχομεν πάντα τὰ μέσα* πρὸς τὰποφασίσαι τὴν μεγίστην ταύτην ἐρώτησιν!

Ε. *Τῶν ἀνωτέρω ρηθέντων τί* δεῖ ἡμᾶς λέγειν καὶ περὶ τῆς δομῆς αὐτοῦ τοῦ Νοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ; Ἰδωμεν πρῶτον τί περὶ τοῦ *σκεπτομένου* Θεοῦ λέγεται ἐν αὐτῇ ταύτῃ τῇ Βίβλῳ *κἄρα ὑπονοεῖται* ὑπὸ τῶν ἀσυζητητῶν εὐλαβῶς παραδεχομένων *ὡς Θεοῦ θέλημα ἐπιβλητέον ἡμῖν ὡς ἐκεῖ ἴσταται* τάκεῖ γεγραμμένα (προσέγγισις πρώτη), ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀποδέχεσθαι ταῦθ' ὡς *ιστόρησιν* τῶν τε θείων κἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων διδομένην ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ *γλώσσῃ καὶ ἄρ' ἀντιλήφει* τοῦ *τε γράφοντος καὶ τῆς ἐποχῆς ἐν ἣ αὐτὸς ἔζησεν*, ἀφ' ἧς ιστορήσεως ὁ ἀναγνώστης-μελετητὴς ὀφείλει προσλαμβάνειν τὸ τε θεῖον καὶ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον *προσεκτικῶς διαχωρίζων* ἐκάτερον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐτέρου (προσέγγισις δευτέρα). Ἀμέσως ἀντιλαμβάνεται πᾶς νουνεχὴς τὴν μεγάλην ὑπάρχουσαν μεταξὺ τῶν δύο τούτων προσεγγίσεων διαφοράν: Διὰ τῆς πρώτης, μειοῦνται ὁ μὲν καταγράψας εἰς οὐσίᾳ *ἀνόητον* ὄργανον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄνευ οἰασδήποτ' ἰδίας θελήσεως ἐνεργοῦν, ἐπιτήδειον εἰς μόνον τὸ *μηχανικῶς* καταγράφειν τὰ ἐκ Θεοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ ἀκουόμενα [κατὰ τό: τοιαῦτα ἀκούω, κατὰ καὶ καταγράφω· ἀποκλείοντος *πᾶσαν* παρέκκλησιν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐντελουμένου ἀκούσματος καθ' ὅλην τὴν διαδικασίαν τῆς δι' ἀκοῆς-κατανοήσεως-ἐκτελέσεως (γγραφῆς) μετατροπῆς τούτου εἰς ἔργον (καταγραφὴν τούτου ὡς *γράμμα-τος*)], ἀκριβῶς ὡς νῦν ἡμεῖς ἔχομεν τὰ διάφορα ἐργαλεῖα *αὐτομάτου* καταγραφῆς τῆς φωνῆς· ὁ δ' ἀναγνώστης-μελετητὴς εἰς *ἄβουλον μηχανικὸν* ὄργανον ἐκτελεστικὸν ἐντολῶν (κατὰ τό: τοιαῦτα ἀναγιγνώσκω, κατὰ ταῦτα ποιῶ· ἀποκλείοντος *πᾶσαν* παρέκκλησιν ἀπὸ τοῦ *ἀναγιγνωσκομένου γράμματος* καθ' ὅλην τὴν διαδικασίαν τῆς δι' ἀναγνώσεως-κατανοήσεως-ἐκτελέ-

σεως μετατροπής τούτου εἰς ἔργον *ἄπτον τελικόν*)· καθ' ἣν ἐντελὴ λειτουργίαν ἀποκλείεται καὶ *πᾶς* ἐκτροπὴ κατὰ τὴν ἀντιστοίχησιν τοῦ *ὑπαγορευομένου* νοήματος καὶ τοῦ γράμματος τοῦ κείμενου δηλοῦντος, κατὰ τὸ πρῶτον αὐτῆς στάδιον, καὶ *πᾶς* ἐκτροπὴ κατὰ τὴν ἀντιστοίχησιν τοῦ διὰ τοῦ γράμματος δηλουμένου *ἀρχικοῦ ὑπαγορευθέντος* νοήματος καὶ τὰποδιδομένου τελικοῦ ἄπτοῦ ἔργου, κατὰ τὸ δεύτερον αὐτῆς στάδιον! *Μὴ δὲ νοηθῇ ὅτι "λεπτομέρεια" περιτταὶ ταῦτα πάντα ἐστί*: Διότι ἐστὶν ὅροι-στάδ' *ἀπαραιτήτα* πρὸς ἀκριβῆ ἐκτέλεσιν ἔργου, ἐντολῆς διδομένης! [Καὶ διὰ τοῦτ' οὐδὲν ἐπιτυχῶς γίγνεθ' ὅτε τοῦ ἐκτελοῦντος παραιτουμένου ἀπὸ παντὸς ἀληθοῦς πνευματικοῦ ἐνδιαφέροντος περὶ τὸ παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐκτελεῖσθ' ἀναμενόμενον ἔργον, οὗτος ἐπαφίεται ταῖς ἐλαχίσταις, στοιχειώδεσιν, ὅλως μηχανικαῖς ἐγκεφαλικάς διαδικασίαις *ἀδυνατούσαις παράγειν* τὸ αὐτῷ ἀνατεθὲν ἔργον!] Καὶ *ἀσφαλῶς* ἀντιλαμβάνεται πᾶς νουνεχὴς ὅτι διὰ τῆς πρώτης αὐτῆς προσεγγίσεως, τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑποβιβαζομένου εἰς τὸ ἐπίπεδον τῆς ἀνοργάνου ὕλης ἐνεργούσης κατὰ τοὺς ἐπ' αὐτῇ νόμους, ἡ πνευματικὴ 'του ὑπόστασις ἐντελῶς ἀφανίζεται! Ἐνῶ διὰ τῆς δευτέρας, τάχ' εἰπεῖν, καὶ διατηρεῖται πᾶς ἡ πνευματικὴ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπόστασις, καὶ καθίσταται αὕτη εἰς τὰπόλυτον λειτουργικὸν ὄργανον ἐκτελέσεως τοῦ πρὸ αὐτῆς ἔργου καὶ κατανοήσεως τοῦ ρόλου αὐτῆς εἰς τὸ *σύνολον φυσικὸν καὶ πνευματικὸν περιβάλλον*, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἀποδίδεται, ὡς ὠφέιλετο, ὡς κατ' *ιδίαν εἰκόνα πνευματικὴν* δημιουργήσας τὸν οὐ μόνον καὶ πνεῦμα, ἀλλὰ κυρίως πνεῦμα πλήρες, *ἐλεύθερον* ὄντ' ἀνθρώπον, ὃν ἠθέλησε *φίλον*, οὐχὶ *δοῦλον* ὡς ἐστὶ τὰ ἐξ ὕλης μόνης τυφλῶς ὑπακούοντα μηχανήματα!

Ὡς ἐν τῇ Βίβλῳ ἴσταται καὶ *ἔτι διδάσκει* αὐτούσιος *εἰς παιδία*, τοῦλάχιστον ὁ τοῦ τῆς Βαβέλ πύργου μῦθος, *συκοφαντῶν τὸν Θεόν, ἀποτελεῖ βλασφημίαν καὶ ὕβριν!* Ἐξ *ἀγάπης* πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν (εἴτε Θεός, εἴτε ἄνθρωπος) ποιεῖ πάνθ' ὅσα *διαλέγει* ποιῆσαι, καὶ εἴτ' αὐτοποβάλλεται εἰς τὸν δεινὸν κόπον τοῦ ὕψους, εἴτ' ἀφίεται κυλίσσθαι πρὸς τὰ βάθη! Τὸ *ἀντικείμενον* τῆς ἀγάπης διαφέρει! Ἡ ἀγάπη ὡς *ἐνέργεια* παραμένει! Σοφὸς ὁ ποιῶν; Οὐ μόνον σοφῶς ἐνεργεῖ-ἀγαπᾷ, ἀλλὰ καὶ σοφῶς *διαλέγει* *τάντικείμενον* τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ! Ἡ παρὰ τὰγαπῶντος ὑστέρα τὰγαπωμένου ἀπόρριψις δηλοῖ τὴν *ἀσοφίαν* τοῦ πρώτου! Ὁ Θεὸς καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἐν παραδείσῳ παράβασιν καὶ κατὰ τὴν οἰκοδόμησιν τῆς Βαβέλ ἐμφανίζετ' *ἀγνοῶν* τὸν παρ' Αὐτοῦ δι' ἀγάπης δημιουργηθέντα, *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς πληττόμενος* ἐξ ὧν οὗτος ποιεῖ, *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἀναγκαζόμενος* προβῆναι εἰς τιμωρίαν! Ἄλλ' ἐκ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων γινώσκομεν ὅτι ὅταν *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* τὸ δημιούργημα ἀτελείας λειτουργίας παρουσιάζῃ, οὐκ αὐτὸ τοῦτο πταίει, ἀλλὰ μόνος ὁ τούτου δημιουργός· ὅπερ ἀναγνωρίζων, ὁ *μερικῆς* σοφίας σχεδιάζων καὶ κατασκευάζων μηχανικὸς ἀνασχεδιάζει *κἀνασκευάζει* *κἀνακατασκευάζει* τὸ αὐτοῦ δημιούργημα! Ὁ *πλήρους* σοφίας δηλούμενος ὢν Δημιουργὸς τοῦ παντός, ἀντιθέτως, οὐ μόνον εἰς οὐδεμίαν κατὰ τὴν Βίβλον προβαίνει ἀνασκευήν, ἀλλὰ *τηρεῖ ἀδιόρθωτον* τὸ Αὐτοῦ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς δυσλειτουργοῦν κατασκευάσμα καὶ *τιμωρεῖ* τοῦτο σκληρῶς! Μετὰ τὴν δημιουργίαν, δι' ἐκδιώξεως· μετὰ τὴν πτώσιν εἰς τὴν προτίμησιν τῆς σαρκός, διὰ κατακλυσμοῦ καὶ πνιγμοῦ· μετὰ τὴν οἰκοδόμησιν τῆς Βαβέλ, διὰ συγχύσεως τῶν γλωσσῶν! Οἱ "Θεολόγοι" ἐπιμέ-

νουςιν ὅτι "Θεόπνευστός ἐστι πᾶσα [παρ' αὐτῶν γεγραμμένη καὶ τηρουμένη] γραφή"! Ἄρα Θεοπνεύστως κατ' αὐτοὺς αὐτοπαρουσιάζετ' ἄσφοδος κᾶδικος καὶ σκληρὸς ὁ "Ἅγιος Θεὸς ἐν τῇ Βίβλῳ [προφανῶς, κατ' αὐτούς, ἵνα οὕτως ἐπιβάλῃ ἢ ἔστω ὑποβάλῃ ἡμῖν τὴν πρὸς Αὐτὸν ὀφειλομένην ἀγάπην]! Ἀλλά, φεῦ, ἐν κεφαλαῖς αὐταποκαλουμένων "ἀγίων" ἐντελῶς ἐγκαταλιπόντων τὸν Λόγον οὐδεὶς φραγμὸς βλασφημίας καὶ ὕβρεως δύναται ἵστασθαι! Ἐξ ἰδίων γὰρ κρίνοντας καὶ τἀλλότρια, ἀνθρώπινά τε καὶ θεία, λατρεῖαν οἱ ἄλογοι ἡγοῦνται Θεοῦ τὰς ἰδίας αὐτῶν κατ' Αὐτοῦ ὕβρεις ἐπὶ χιλιάδας ἐτῶν! Τῶν ἀνθρώπων φερομένων ὑποπεσόντων εἰς ὅσα κατ' αὐτῶν μαρτυροῦνται πρὸ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ, ὁ Θεὸς δηλοῦται μεταμεληθεὶς διὰ τὸ ποιῆσαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον! Διὰ τοσαύτης δὴθεν δεινῆς "Θεολογικῆς" γνώσεως περὶ τῆς συνοχῆς τοῦ Νοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὗτος δηλοῦται ποιῶν καὶ μεταμελούμενος καὶ ἐπιφέρων καταστροφήν τε καὶ σύγχυσιν! Ἄλλ' ὥς ἀπὸ τοῦ Νῶε ἕως τῆς Βαβέλ οὐδεμία νέα ἀπειθεία φέρετ' ἐπισυμβᾶσα κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐδέ τις μετ' Αὐτοῦ σύγκρουσις πρὸς κυριαρχίαν, ἄρ' ἐξ ἀγάπης πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, οὐκ ἐκ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας τοῦ ὑποσκελίσαι Αὐτόν, δεῖται συναγαγέσθαι ὅτι οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἐπεζήτησαν διὰ τοῦ πύργου εἰς τὸν Οὐρανὸν ἀνελθεῖν! Ὅμως ὅτι ἐπέφερε τὴν σύγχυσιν τῶν γλωσσῶν φοβηθεὶς τὴν ἐκεῖ τούτων ἀνάβασιν φέρεται ὁ Θεός! Ἀλλὰ πῶς ὁ Θεὸς φοβεῖται τὸν ἄνθρωπον; Καὶ πῶς Ἄγαθος ὢν συγχέει ἀμυνόμενος τὴν γλῶσσαν αὐτοῦ; Ἀμαρτία ἢ συγκρότησις πόλεως; Ἀμαρτία ἢ ἐν τῷ μέσῳ αὐτῆς ἀνέγερσις πύργου, τουτέστιν οἴκου λατρείας Θεοῦ; Ἀσφαλῶς οὐ! [Ἐὰν δὲ λεχθῇ ὅτι προέβλεψεν ὁ Θεὸς τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ αὐτῷ γενησόμενα φοβερά, πῶς, ἐρωτᾶται, προτιμωρεῖ Θεὸς δίκαιος; Ἡ μήπως ἐξ ἰδίων κρίνοντας τὰ παρ' αὐτῶν ἐν πόλεσι καὶ ναοῖς συντελούμενα, ἐπὶ τῷ προσώπῳ Θεοῦ εἰκονίζουσι τὰς σφετέρας προθέσεις καὶ διαθέσεις;] Πῶς δὲ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐχόντων ὅσον οὐδεὶς ἄλλος ἀνεπτυγμένην τὴν ἔννοιαν τῆς δικαίως παρ' αὐτῶν φοβουμένης κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὕβρεως, οὐ καθαρῶς δυτικασιατικά, οὐ γὰρ δὲ πῶς ἐλληνικά, δύνατ' εἶναι τὰ περὶ Βαβέλ κάλλ' ἀνάλογ' ἔτι λεγόμενα; Ἀλλὰ καὶ πῶς οἱ πιστεύοντες εἰς Χριστὸν χόμολογοῦντες Αὐτὸν τοῦ κόσμου Δημιουργὸν ἔτι πιστεύουσι τὰ καθαρὰ περὶ Βαβέλ ψεύδη; Διότι πῶς ὁ ὕστερον καταβὰς ἵν' ἐς Οὐρανὸν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀναβιβάσῃ ἐφοβήθη τότε τὴν πρὸς Αὐτὸν ἐκείνων ἀνάβασιν; Καὶ πῶς ἔξεστι "Θεολόγοις" μὲν ἐπιμένειν ἐνσταλάζειν τοιαῦτα ἐν ψυχαῖς καὶ πνεύμασι παίδων, ἡμῖν δὲ τοῖς λοιποῖς παραμένειν χάσκοντας θεατὰς οὐδ' ἐπὶ στιγμὴν ἀναλογιζομένους ὅτι ὡς ἐν ἐκείνοις σπείρομεν ὅμοια καὶ θερίσομεν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῆς αὐτῶν ὠριμάσεως;

Πῶς αἵρεται ἡ περὶ τὴν Βαβέλ κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὕβρις; Διὰ τοῦ, ὅπερ καὶ ἀληθές, ὅτι τόσος ἀληθῶς ἐστὶν ὁ πλοῦτος τῶν θείων καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων, τῆς ὅλης Πραγματικότητος, ὥστ' ἀδύνατον τὸ ἐκφράσαι αὐτὰ "ἐν μιᾷ γλώσσῃ καὶ μιᾷ φωνῇ" ("in one language and few words"), οἷα τότε εἶχον οἱ ἄνθρωποι· καὶ ὅτι ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ πρώτῃ αὐτῶν προσπάθειᾳ καταγνώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, οἱ ἄνθρωποι μᾶλλον κατέγνωσαν μὲν τὴν ἀδυναμίαν τῆς μιᾶς τότε κοινῆς πλὴν πτωχῆς αὐτῶν γλώσσης, σύναμ' ὅμως δὲ καὶ διεσπάσθησαν ἐξ αἰτίας τῆς ἀναγκαίας δημιουργίας ποικίλων ἀκριβεστέρων τρόπων ἐκφράσεως τοῦ μεγάλου βαθμῆδὸν ἀποκαλυπτομένου πλήθους τῶν πρότερον ἀγνώ-

stown αὐτοῖς ἐννοιῶν καὶ πραγμάτων, τῆς ἀφεύκτου δημιουργίας νέων γλωσσῶν ἐκ παραφθορᾶς, καὶ τῆς ἀνακαλύψεως πολλαπλῶν δῆθεν ἐρμηνειῶν τῶν μερῶν τοῦ, καὶ τοῦ δι' αὐτῶν οὕτω διαφεύγοντος, τῆς Πραγματικότητος ὅλου· πάντων τούτων ὄντων σταδίων καὶ μέσων τῆς προσπάθειας ἐπὶ τὸ κατανόησαι τὰ πράγματα! Κατὰ ταύτην τὴν ἐρμηνείαν, ὁ ἐσφαλμένως ἐν τῇ Βίβλῳ καταγραφόμενος τῆς Βαβέλ μῦθος οὐσίᾳ ἱστορεῖ τὸ πρῶτον βῆμα τῆς πνευματικῆς τάνθρώπου πορείας! Ἦτις νῦν ἐφθασεν ἐπὶ τέλους ἐς τὸ ὁλοκληροῦν τὸν ἐκεῖ τότ' ἀρξάμενον κύκλον αὐτῆς! Διότι τί ἀληθῶς νῦν συμβαίνει; Πότε πρότερον ἐκτῆμεθα γνῶσιν μείζονα τῆς παρούσης; Καὶ πότε πρότερον ἀπὸ τῆς Βαβέλ τόσοι γενικῶς ἀνεμείχθησαν ὡς νῦν οἱ λαοί, κἂν ἔστω δι' ἄλλην αἰτίαν; Καὶ πότε πρότερον ὡς νῦν τόσα γιγνώσκοντες καὶ ὡς νῦν τόσοι ἀναμειγμένοι εἶχον οἱ ἄνθρωποι τοιαύτην ὡς νῦν δυνατότητα ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ εἰς ἓν ὅλον συντάξαι ὅσα κεχωρισμένως πλὴν ἐν τῇ κοινῇ ἀπὸ τῆς Βαβέλ προσπάθειά αἰώνων μετὰ τόσοι κόπου ἀπεταμίευσαν ἐν νῷ καὶ ψυχῇ; Καὶ πῶς ἄρα ἐπιμενούμεν ἡμεῖς τηρεῖν ἀπ' ἀλλήλων κεχωρισμένους τοὺς πρότερον δι' ἀδυναμίαν, ἄγνοϊαν, ἢ καὶ πάθη διεσπασμένους εἰς μέρη καὶ κοινωνίας μισούσας καὶ πολεμούσας ἀλλήλας, πλὴν νῦν, κἂν ἔστω δι' ἄλλην αἰτίαν, ἐρχομένους εἰρηρικῶς σὺν ἀδελφοῖς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ζῆν ἐν μιᾷ κοινωνίᾳ πάντων τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς κατοικούντων; Πῶς ὅλως ἄλλα ποιοῦμεν!

Διὰ ταῦτα, μειζόνως ἢ ποτε πρότερον βαρύνονται οἱ νῦν ποικιλοτρόπως ἀρνούμενοι ἀναλαβεῖν τὰς εὐθύνas αὐτῶν κακῶς ὀχυρούμενοι ὀπισθεν παρελθουσῶν ἐννοιῶν πολιτικῆς, φιλοσοφίας, θρησκείας ἢ ἐπιστήμης, πρὸς ἀνεπίτρεπτον πλεόν, οὐχ ὑπὲρ τοῦ Καλοῦ "ὑπεράσπισιν" τῆς τοπικῆς αὐτοῦ ἕκαστος κοινωνίας, ἢ ἔθνους, ἢ ἐκκλησίας (μηδέποτε κατιδούσης τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τεθὲν πρὸ ἡμῶν συνολικὸν πρόβλημα), ἢ θρησκευτικῆς πεποιθήσεως, εἴτ' ἀναφερομένης εἰς Θεὸν Ζῶντα, εἴτ' ἀναφερομένης εἰς τὴν μαγικὰς δῆθεν ἱκανότητος ἔχουσαν τυχαίότητα! Καὶ γὰρ ἔχομεν νῦν πάντα τὰ μέσα διὰ τὸ τελειωτικῶς ἀποφαίνεσθαι περὶ τῆς οὐσίας τῆς Ἀληθείας τῆς Πραγματικότητος! Οὐδεμία γὰρ πλέον ὑπάρχει ἐλπίς ὅτι αἱ ἔτι ἀφ' ἡμῶν διαφεύγουσαι λεπτομέρειαι καταστήσονται ποτε κτῆμα ἡμῶν. Ἀσφαλῶς δυνησόμεθα πλείονας θεωρίας δημιουργεῖν. Ὅμως θεωρίας οὐδεμίαν ἐχούσας ἐλπίδ' ἀληθοῦς ἀποδείξεως τῆς ἀληθείας αὐτῶν, καθότι ἐξηντλήσαμεν πλέον τὰ ὅρια ἐπεκτάσεως τῶν πειραματικῶν ἐργαλείων ἐρεῦνης, ὡς τάκουρῶθεν superconducting supercollider! Οὐδὲν ἐργαλεῖον ἐρεῦνης μέχρι τοῦδε γνωστὸν ἢ ἐν νῷ συλληψόμενον δυνησεται καταστήσειν περιττὴν τὴν γένεσιν περαιτέρω θεωριῶν, αἵτινες νέα ἀπαραιτήτως ἀπαιτήσουσιν ἐπαληθευτικὰ αὐτῶν ἐργαλεῖα, τῆς σειρᾶς οὕτως ἀπεριορίστως ἐπεκτεινομένης! Ἄλλ' οὐδόλως καθίστησι τοῦτ' ἀδύνατον τὴν ἀνεύρεσιν τῆς πρὸ ἡμῶν Ἀληθείας! Τοῦτο μόνην καθίστησι περιττὴν τὴν ἄκαρπον-ἀτέρμονα διὰ ποδῶν καὶ χειρῶν πειραματικὴν καταδίωξιν ταύτης! Νῦν ἐφ' ἡμῶν ὁ καιρὸς τοῦ τιθέναι ἐπὶ τὸ ἔργον τὸν καθαρὸν ἡμῶν Λόγον! Πάντες ὀφείλομεν ταῦτα κατανόησαι: Οἱ μὲν ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ πεποιθότες ὅτι οὐ βασανίζει ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς πεπερασμένους ἡμᾶς θεῖς πρὸ τοῦ ἀπείρου! Οἱ δ' ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ μὴ πεποιθότες ὅτι ἔχοντες νοῦν καὶ αὐτοῦ χρώμενοι πάντως μόνον γελοῖως δύναντ' ἀρνεῖσθαι τὸ Λόγου βασίλειον! Καιρὸς ἄρα τοῦ κατιδεῖν διὰ τοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν πᾶσι

Λόγου ποῦ ὁ Ἀκέραιος ἔστιν! Οἱ πρὸ τῆς προκλήσεως ταύτης παραμένοντες ἀπαθεῖς, ὡς νεκροί! "Ὅτι μόνοι νεκροὶ ἴστανται ἀπαθεῖς πρὸ τοῦ Λόγου!

Τοιαῦτα μὲν ὡς τὰ ὡς ἄνω ἡμεῖς λέγοντες κατὰ Λόγον τὰ πράγματα κρίνοντας, *πῶς* ἄρα δυνάμεθα λέγειν ὅτι ἦσων τοῦ ἡμετέρου ἐστὶν ὁ Νοῦς τοῦ Θεοῦ; Ἰκανῶς δὲ νῦν οὕτως ἀποδειχθείσης τῆς ἐκεῖθεν κάκειθεν κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑβρεως, *πῶς* ἐμμενοῦμεν διχαστικῶς, οἱ μὲν περὶ τὴν δῆθεν Ἐπιστήμην, οἱ δὲ περὶ τὴν δῆθεν Θεολογίαν, *ἀμφοτέρας ψευδεῖς ὡς γε νῦν ἴστανται*, καὶ οὐκ ἐπιδιώξομεν τὸν ἔλλογον τούτων συγκερασμόν; Ἡ ἔτι κρυπτόμενοι ὀπισθεν *τάσιατικοῦ* "ἀνέκφραστος, ἀπερινόητος, ἀόρατος, ἀκατάληπτος ὁ Θεός", δι' οὗ βαθμηδὸν ἐφθάσαμεν εἰς παντελὴ ὡς καὶ περὶ *τῆς ὑπάρξεως* Τούτου ἀμφιβολίαν, ἐπιμενοῦμεν αἰδημόνως(;) *ἀνερυνθιάστως* σιωπῶντες, καλοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς "(δῆθεν) ὑγιές(;) θρησκευτικὸν *συναίσθημα* (τουτέστι μὴ *τρεφόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν Λόγου*) ἔχοντας", καὶ "*καρδιακοῦς*", καὶ "*ψυχικοῦς*", οὐδέποθ' ὅμως καὶ "*διανοητικοῦς*" μισοῦντες τὸν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ *δοθέντα ἡμῖν Καθαρόν Λόγον*, ὥστε καὶ δι' ὅλης τῆς *διανοίας ἡμῶν ἀγαπᾶν Ἀλήθειαν καὶ Θεόν*; Εἰ δὲ Λόγος ἐστὶν ὁ Θεός, *πῶς* οὐκ ἐστὶ Καθαρός; Ἔστι καθαρώτερος ὁ τῶν ἀνθρώπων μᾶλλον ἢ ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος; Ἡ *τολμήσει ἐρεῖν* τις ὅτι οὐ Λόγος ἐστὶν ὁ Θεός; *Τί γὰρ ἐγένετο κείνο τὸ "ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος"*; Καὶ *τί τὸ "ἀγαπήσεις Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου ... καὶ δι' ὅλης τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ δι' ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου"*; Ὁ Θεὸς κατεσκεύασεν ἡμᾶς *πλήρεις!* *Ποία μεσαιωνικὴ διαστροφή* ἐπέβαλεν ἐφ' ἡμῶν τὴν *περιφρόνησιν* τῆς *διανοίας* τοῦ Λόγου, *κάπεβαλεν ἀφ' ἡμῶν τὴν ἀνάγκην* τοῦ *τιθέναι καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν τῆς διανοίας ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τὸ Λογικὸν χρῆμα ἀγάπης* πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, ὡς τὸ *ὑψιστον ἀντικείμενον πόθου* παντὸς ἀγαπᾶν δυνάμενον; *Διατί ἀρνούμεθα σκέπτεσθαι πάσας τὰς συνεπείας πάντων ἃ λέγομεν*, ὡς καὶ *πάσης παραΛόγου κᾶρα δῆθεν "ἀγάπης"*, *κᾶν ἀφ' ὑψηλῶν ἀρχιερατικῶν θώκων μετὰ περισσῆς ἀλλὰ νῦν ἄκρως ὑπόπτου "εὐλαβείας"* *τονιζομένης ὡς δῆθεν "μόνον ἐκεῖθεν"* προσφερομένης ἀφιλοκερδῶς; *Διατί* οἱ Θεολόγοι ἔτι ἀρνοῦνται κατανοῆσαι *χόμελογησαι* ὅτι *τούλάχιστον ἐπὶ δισχιλιετίαν δοκιμασθεῖς ὁ δυτικασιατικὸς οὐχ ἑλληνικὸς αὐτῶν τρόπος*, ὁ κατὰ τὸν μεσαίωνα διὰ *διασπάσεως τῆς μιᾶς ἡνωμένης δῆθεν θεολογικῆς διανοήσεως ἐπεκταθεῖς* *κᾶς τὴν ἐπιστήμην κάκειθεν ἀντιστραφεῖς* ὥστ' ἀμοιβαίως ἕως τοῦ νῦν *μισῶνται τὰ διϋστάμενα μέρη*, ὁ αὐτόσε, *οὐκ εἰς Οὐρανόν, ἡμᾶς ἀγαγόν, ἀπέτυχε πλήρως*, ἀκριβῶς διότι *ἡρνήθη ἕως τοῦ νῦν συμπεριλαβεῖν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τῆς διανοίας ἡμῶν ὅλης, μόνης δυναμένης φωτίσαι* οὐ μόνον τὰ πρὸς τὸν πλησίον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν τὰνθρώπου καθήκοντα;

Διὰ ταῦτα οὖν πάντα, Λογικῶ νῦν συνεχόμενοι φόβῳ, *ἀξιωματικωτάτην ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνευ οἰασδήποτ' ἀπροσδιοριστίας* δηλοῦμεν *χόμελογοῦμεν* τὴν δομὴν τῆς Νοήσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὡς καὶ τὴν δομὴν παντὸς ὅπερ Οὗτος ἐδημιούργησε! *For there is nothing fuzzy about Truth that includes everything in the Mind of God!* Ὁ Θεὸς οὐκ ἐμπίπτει εἰς τοιούτου εἶδους, ὡς τὰ τοῦ Gödel καὶ Tarski, ἀνθρώπινα θεωρήματα! "Ἀρ' οὕτε καὶ *πάν Αὐτοῦ κατασκευάσμα!* Αἱ δοκούμεν' ἐν τῇ φύσει ἀπροσδιορισταί καὶ αἱ θεωρίαι δι' ὧν αὗται εἰσάγονται εἰσὶ καθαρὰ *ἀνθρώπινα σφάλματα!*

ΣΤ. Τὸ συνέδριον ὡς ὀργανώθη καὶ ὡς ἐν αὐτῷ ἐπαρουσιάσθη τὰ θέματα, ποιήσαντα κατὰ τὸ πλεῖστον γυμνῇν *lip service to God* ὃ,που ἐπεχειρήθη *ἰσχυροτάτη* ἀναφορὰ εἰς τὴν "Ὁρθοδοξίαν", ἀπέτυχε φεῦ ἀναδείξει τὴν *Λόγῳ ἐνότητά*, οὐχὶ *βεβαίως* τὸ ὁμοούσιον, τῆς Πραγματικότητος! Ἐκεῖνα τάσιαιτικὰ ὡς ἄνω ἀναφερθέντα, ἐπ' αἰῶνας μακροὺς ἀσιγήτως ἐπαναλαμβάνόμενα, ἐποίησαν τὸ καταστροφικὸν αὐτῶν ἔργον! Ἐλθὼν ὁ Χριστός, δὴλον παντὶ τρόπῳ τόθ' ἡμῖν κατανοητῷ τὸν Πατέρα ποιήσας, καταλιπὼν τὰ λοιπ' ἅπερ οὐκ ἐδυνάμεθα τότε κατανοῆσαι εἰς τὴν ἐφ' ἡμῖν συνεργούσιν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ὡς μὴδὲν ἐν ἡμῖν διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν κακίαν ἀπέβη! Πλὴν, ὡς εἰκός, ὡς εἶδος σημαίας καλυπτούσης τὰ παντοῖα ἡμῶν ἀνομήματα, μεταλλαγείσας δεισιδαιμονίας, καὶ τοὺς "θρησκευτικούς" *καθαρῶς ψυχολογικούς, συναισθηματικούς, οὐδέποτε Λογικούς* ἡμῶν φόβους! Τὸν ὡς *Δημιουργὸν καὶ Χριστὸν ἐκφρασθέντα, περινοηθέντα, ὁραθέντα, καταληφθέντα* "Ἐνα Ὁλον Θεόν, τὸ δῆθεν "χριστιανικὸν" ἀρχιερατεῖον *"ἀνέκφραστον, ἀπερινόητον, ἀόρατον, ἀκατάληπτον"* ἐμμένει καλεῖν δι' ἀπιστίαν *κἀδυναμίαν τῆς οὐδέποτ' ἀσκηθείσης διανοίας αὐτοῦ*, προκαλοῦν παντοῖαν ἀμφιβολίαν! Τὸ τὸν πνευματικὸν ἄνθρωπον διασπάσαν, *βιαίως ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὴν διάνοιαν ἀποσπάσαν*, χῦστερον ὀντολογικῶς τὰ λοιπ' αὐτοῦ "συνενώσαν", τόσον ὥστε *σύνεδρόν τιν' οὐκ ἀδίκως διαπορεῖν* πῶς ἐστι δυνατόν κατανοεῖν καὶ ἔτι ὀρίζειν ὡς ἀφ' ἡμῶν ἀνεξάρτητον κἀληθῶς αἰδίου Πνεῦμα τὸν Θεὸν Κύριον, εἰ τάνθρωπινον πνεῦμα καὶ πάντα τὰ παρ' αὐτοῦ παραγόμεν' ἔστιν ἀπόρροια τῶν ἐγκεφαλικῶν διεργασιῶν τοῦ δῆθεν "ἐνιαίου" καὶ δῆθεν "ἀδιασπάστου" κατὰ τό τε σῶμα καὶ πνεῦμα ἀνθρώπου· ὅς παρὰ ταῦτα πεισματικῶς ἐπιμένει, ὡς καὶ διὰ χειλέων τῶν διδασκάλων αὐτοῦ καθηγητῶν καὶ ἀρχιερέων, τηρεῖν ἀπ' ἀλλήλων μακρὰν τὴν Ἐπιστήμην καὶ Θεολογίαν, οὕσας ἀδελφάς, θυγατέρας τοῦ δῆθεν "ἐνιαίου" κατὰ τό τε σῶμα καὶ πνεῦμα ἀνθρώπου! Πλὴν, ὡς εἰκός, ὅταν συνέρχωνται *lip service* δοῦναι ἀλλήλαις, καὶ τοῖς καθηγηταῖς καὶ ἀρχιερεῦσιν, οὗ γε τῷ Θεῷ! Ὡς ὅτι λεγόμενος *"ἀνέκφραστος, ἀπερινόητος, ἀόρατος, ἀκατάληπτος"* ὁ Θεός, *"δικαίως"* ἄρα παραμένει ἐκτὸς τοῦ πεδίου βολῆς πρώτης τῆς διανοίας αὐτῶν! Ἀλλὰ τότε πρὸς τί πᾶς ἡ Θεο"λογία"; Πῶς χρωμένη λόγων ὅλως ἀμφιβόλου νοήματος ἐφ' ὅσον τάντικείμενον παραμένει *"ἀνέκφραστον, ἀπερινόητον, ἀόρατον, ἀκατάληπτον"* οὐ καθίσταται αὕτη *ἀνειλικρινῆς τρόπος ἐπιβολῆς τοῦ λίαν ὁρατοῦ ἀρχιερατείου*, ὅπερ ἐνεργοῦν ἐπ' ὀνόματι δῆθεν *"ἀνέκφραστον, ἀπερινόητον, ἀόρατον, ἀκατάληπτον"* *κᾶρα παντάπασι τρομακτικῆς "δυνάμεως"* δι' αὐτοῦ μόνου *μαντικῶς πλέον οὐ Λογικῶς* προσεγγίζεσθαι δυναμένης, *παραλόγως τρομοκρατεῖ τὸν λαόν, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτοῦ ἑαυτὸ ἐπιβάλλει*; Πῶς δ' οὐκ ἀντιλαμβάνεται τοῦτο ὅτι τοιαῦτα διατεινόμενον ἐπ' αἰῶνας μακροὺς *ὑποσκάπτει* οὐ μόνον τὸν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν *ὑγιῆ Λογικὸν σεβασμὸν* τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτοῦ θέσιν ἐν κοινωνίᾳ ἀνθρώπων *δυναμένων πλέον ἀθροίζειν* τὰ παρ' αὐτοῦ δηλούμεν' ὡς δι' ἑστάμενα;

Αὐτὸ πρῶτον τὸ δῆθεν "χριστιανικὸν" ἀρχιερατεῖον *οὐδεμίαν βαθεΐαν ἐπιστημονικὴν χρῆσιν* τῆς διανοίας ποιούμενον, *ἐλησμόνησεν* ὅτι ὡς ὁ Θεός ἐστι Πνεῦμα, ἄρα μόνον κατὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐσμὲν ἡμεῖς Ἐκείνου εἰκῶν, ὡς δ' ὁ χοῦς ἐστιν ὕλη καὶ δημιούργημα ὀντολογικῶς διαφέρον ἀπὸ τοῦ Πνεύ-

ματος, ἄρα ἡμεῖς, κατὰ καθαρὸν Πνεῦμα *εἰκόνες πνευματικαὶ* Πνεύματος ὄντες (διὰ τὴν *ἐντελὴ συνοχήν* εἰκονίζοντος πρὸς εἰκονιζόμενον), ἐνῶ κατὰ σῶμα ὡς καθαρὰ ὕλη ὑπάρχουμεν, *διασπαστοὶ ἐσμεν κατὰ τὴν συρραφήν (αὐτὴν μόνην) τῆς διφυοῦς ἡμῶν φύσεως*, ὡς *ὄντολογικῶς ὅλως ἄλλη καὶ ξένη* ἐστὶν ἡ φύσις τοῦ Πνεύματος ἀπὸ κείνης τῆς ὕλης!

Αὐτὸ πρῶτον τὸ δῆθεν "χριστιανικὸν" ἀρχιερατεῖον οὐδέποτε κατενόησεν ὅτι "ἐπανελθὼν" (ὡς λέγεται, κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀτελὴ γλῶσσαν) πρὸς τὸν Πρῶτον-Λόγον-Πατέρα ὁ οὐδέποτ' ἀπὸ Κείνου *"ἀναχωρήσας"* Δεύτερος-Λόγος-Χριστός, οὐδεμίαν ἐκεῖ μετέφερεν ὕλην, καθ' ὅτι *Τέλειος αἰὶ ὦν ὁ Θεός, οὐδεμίαν ποτ' ἔσχηκε χρεῖαν "μείζονος" τελειότητος* ὥστ' "ἐνσωματῶσαι" (to "incorporate") ἐντὸς τῆς ὄντολογικῶς *καθαρῶς Πνευματικῆς* Ἀγίας Τριάδος τὴν ὄντολογικῶς *ξένην* ὕλην μετὰ τὴν Ἀνάληψιν τοῦ Κυρίου, ὡς *καὶ ὄντολογικῶς καὶ Λογικῶς, πᾶς ἐνσωμάτωσις ξένου ἐν ξένῳ ἀδύνατός ἐστι* καὶ τὰ συμβάντα μετὰ τὴν Ἀνάστασιν οὐδεμίαν δηλοῖ συνένωσιν τῶν Λογικῶς ὄντολογικῶς διεστώτων, *γενόμενα μόνον ἵνα πεισθῶμεν ὅτι ὄντως αὐτεξουσιαστικῶς ἀνέστη (οὐ παθητικῶς ἀνεστήθη) ὁ Κύριος*, ὡς ὅτι οὐδεμίαν ἄλλως εἴχομεν ἢ πειστικὴν μαρτυρίαν τῆς Ἀναστάσεως, εἰ οὐ διὰ τῶν *ὕλικῶν ἡμῶν ὀφθαλμῶν* ἐλαμβάνομεν τὴν περὶ ταύτης πληροφορίαν, ἀδυνατοῦντες καὶ τότε, ὡς φεῦ ἔτι καὶ νῦν, τῆς ὅλης διανοίας ἡμῶν χρῆσιν ποιῆσαι πρὸς τὸ κατανοεῖν τὰ καθαρὰ πνευματικά! [Εἰ χρῆσιν τῆς ὅλης διανοίας ἡμῶν ἐποιούμεν, ἀντελαμβάνομεθα ἂν ὅτι κατὰ τὴν Ἀνάστασιν τοῦ Κυρίου, συγκεφαλαιώσαντος ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸν Ἐνα Θεὸν καὶ τὴν δημιουργίαν αὐτοῦ, τὸ νεκρὸν ταφέν Αὐτοῦ σῶμα ἐγένετο *φυσικὸν φῶς* ἐκλυθέν, *συμμαρτυροῦν τὸ ποῖόν τῆς ὅλης φυσικῆς δημιουργίας*, ὡς ὅτι *φῶς δημιουργηθέν φυσικὸν ὄντολογικῶς ἀπὸ τῆς δημιουργίας τοῦ σύμπαντος ἐστὶ πᾶσα ἡ ὕλη*, ἥς μικρὸν μέρος ἐκλαμβάνομεν ὡς *φυσικὸν φῶς ἐκλυόμενοι*, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ὡς "συμπαγὴ" σώματα! Ὡς καὶ ὅτι *Φῶς-Θεὸς καὶ φῶς-ὕλη* οὕτως ὅλος ὦν ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς περιπατήσας Χριστός, *ἀναλλοίωτος ὡς Φῶς τε καὶ φῶς ἀπὸ τοῦ τάφου ἀνέστη ἐντελῶς κενώσας αὐτὸν καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ διὰ παντός καὶ τὸν Ἄδην, καὶ ὡς τοιοῦτος Πνεύματί τε καὶ σώματι παρέστη τοῖς μαθηταῖς*, ἀναλαβὼν τὴν αὐτοῖς γνωστὴν ἰδίαν μορφήν *εἰς πιστοποιήσιν τῆς Αὐτοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν Ἀναστάσεως!*]

Αὐτὸ πρῶτον τὸ δῆθεν "χριστιανικὸν" ἀρχιερατεῖον ἐμμένει, ὡς καθαρῶτατα ἐδηλώθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου Τιράνων, εἰς *σαφῆ διαχωρισμὸν* τῆς ἐπιστήμης ἀπὸ τῆς εἰς Θεὸν πίστεως, ἀπαιτοῦν, τόσον *ἀφοπλιστικῶς ἄλλ' οὐ πειστικῶς* εὐγενῶς, ἀμοιβαῖον σεβασμὸν τῶν δικαιωμάτων ἐκατέρας ἀπὸ τῆς ἐτέρας, καὶ *πλήρη ἀποχήν* ἀπὸ πάσης παρεμβάσεως ἐκατέρας εἰς τὰ τῆς ἐτέρας ὡς ἂν αἱ δύο ὡσι κόσμοι ξένοι, ἀπολύτως κεχωρισμένοι, *ὁμονοοῦντες μόνον ἐπὶ τὰπολύτως ξένον αὐτῶν*, οὐχὶ δὲ μέρη τοῦ ἐνὸς αὐτοῦ *ἀδαιρέτου πνευματικοῦ κόσμου τῆς μιᾶς αὐτῆς Πραγματικότητος*, κατ' ἀπόφασιν *τε καὶ σχέδιον* αὐτοῦ τοῦ Λόγου-Θεοῦ ὃν τἀρχιερατεῖον δῆθεν ὑπηρετεῖ, ἀλλ' οὐδόλως καὶ ὡς *Λόγον* κατανοεῖ, *ἀρνούμενον* τῆς ὅλης διανοίας χρῆσιν ποιεῖν! Διὰ τὸ ἱερατεῖον οὐκ ἀποσκοπεῖ εἰς *διατήρησιν ἐν τῇδε ζωῇ τῆς παραλόγου διασπάσεως* τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, παραχωροῦν τὸ κατ' ἐπιστήμην μέρος αὐτοῦ τῇ "ἐπιστήμῃ" καὶ διατη-

ροῦν δι' ἑαυτὸ τὸν *παράλογον* ἄνευ τοῦ μέρους αὐτοῦ λοιπὸν ἄνθρωπον, συνεχόμενον *φόβῳ*, ἀλλ' οὐ *Λογικῷ φόβῳ*; Διατί ἄρα τοῦτο, εἰ τὸ ἱερατεῖον οὐκ ἀποσκοπεῖ εἰς διατήρησιν *τάνθρώπου ὡς πεδίου καὶ θύματος τῆς συνεχοῦς διαμάχης μετὰ τῆς ἐπιστήμης*, ἣν *κακῶς* θεωρεῖ μέρος τοῦ ὑλικοῦ κόσμου, εἰ μὴ *εὐθέως* ἐκ τοῦ *πονηροῦ ἐρχομένην*, κατὰ τὴν *μυριοτρόπως ἐγκρυπτομένην καὶ δι' αὐτῶν τῶν ἰδίων διασφζομένην ἀσιατικὴν μανιχαῖστικὴν, οὐκ ἐξ Ἑλλήνων, παράδοσιν*;

Αὐτὸ πρῶτον τὸ *δῆθεν* "χριστιανικὸν" ἀρχιερατεῖον *βλασφημεῖ τὸν Θεὸν* οὐδέποτε κατανοήσαν τὰ συμβάντα τε καὶ συμβαίνοντα καὶ ἐμμένον εἰς τὴν ἀντίληψιν τοῦ *δῆθεν* ἀναποδείκτου τῆς ὑπάρξεως τοῦ Θεοῦ! "Ὅτε ἦλθεν ὁ Κύριος, πάντες ἐπίστευον εἰς τὸν Θεὸν ἢ τοὺς θεούς. Λογικώταται οὖν ἦσαν τότε διὰ τὸν *τότε καιρὸν* αἱ εἰς τὴν πίστιν ἀναφοραὶ τῆς *Καινῆς Διαθήκης*. Διὰ δὲ τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἔκτοτ' ἀκολουθήσαντα, ἡ μέριμνα ἀνήκει, *ἀνήκει* εἰς τὸ "Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, τὸ πάντως *μόνον ἐν πνεύμασι ζῶσι καὶ Κεῖνῳ* συμπράττουσι *διαλάμπον* ὅσας οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἤδη *δύνανται, ὡς καθίστανται ἔτοιμοι, δέχεσθ'* ἀποκαλύψεις τῆς Ἀληθείας! Ὡς ὁ κόσμος ἥλλαξεν ἔκτοτε, προφανὲς ὅτι αἱ τότε γενόμεν' ἀποκαλύψεις οὔτε πλέον ἀρκοῦσιν ὡς *ἐλλειπῶς* κατεγράφησαν τότε κατὰ τὴν *τότ'* ἀντίληψιν τῶν πραγμάτων καὶ δυνάμιν ἐρμηνείας αὐτῶν, οὔτε πλέον καὶ ἐπιτρέπεται αὐταῖς διακατέχειν ἡμᾶς ὡς "κατενοήθησαν" τότε ἢ ὡς νῦν "κατανοοῦμεν" τὰς ἰδίας μὲν λέξεις ὅμως δ' ἀποβαλοῦσας τὸ *μὴ καταγραφέν* τότ' ἐχόμενον ἀλλὰ νῦν ἡμῖν ἄγνωστον αὐτῶν νόημα! Ἡ *συμπλήρωσις, οὐσα ἐπιτακτικὴ*, τῶν τότ' ἀποκαλυφθέντων ἀνήκει εἰς τὸ "Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, ὡς ὅτι *οὐ πάσ' ἡ Θεία Σοφία ἀπεκαλύφθη ὡς καταγέγραπται* τότε, ὡς ὅτι ἄλλως οὐδὲν οὐσιῶδες *εἶχεν ἂν ποιεῖν ἐν ἡμῖν τὸ "Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα!* Πλὴν ἂν οἱ πρὸς ταῦτα διαφωνοῦντες αὐτό γε βούλονται λέγειν! Ὁ κόσμος *ὄντως* ἥλλαξεν ἔκτοτε! Οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἔπαυσαν πιστεύειν οὐ μόνον εἰς τοὺς θεούς, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν Θεόν! Εἰ ἀληθῶς ἐπιστεύομεν *τὰ πάντα καθορῶν Πρόσωπον Ζῶν τὸν Θεόν*, οὐκ ἂν ἐποιοῦμεν ὅσα παντελῶς ἀπρεπῶς νῦν ποιοῦμεν! Τὰ *ἔργα, οὐχὶ ὁ κενὸς ἡμῶν λόγος*, δείκνυσιν τὴν τε πίστιν καὶ ἀπιστίαν ἡμῶν! Ἡ πλήρης καθολικὴ ἀνακαίνισις βίου ἀνθρώπων καὶ κοινωνίας διὰ τῆς πίστεως εἰς Θεὸν διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ οὐδέποτε ἐπραγματοποιήθη ὥστε διὰ τῆς *ἐν ταῖς ἡμῶν πράξεσιν ἐνδεδυμένης ἡμῶν πίστεως μόνης ζωτικῶς ἀποδεικνύναι ἀπὸ γενεᾶς εἰς γενεάν* τὴν Χριστοῦ περὶ Θεοῦ μαρτυρίαν! Καὶ νῦν γεγόναμεν "ὁμολογηταὶ" πίστεως δι' ἐγγράφων βαπτίσεως *νηπίων*, ὡς ἂν ἐκεῖ ἐξηγτλεῖτο τὸ χρέος τῆς πίστεως ὡς καὶ γερόντων! *Διὰ τῆς ψυχρανθείσης πίστεως τῶν πιστῶν εἰσῆλθεν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ πρώτη ἡ ἀμφιβολία καὶ εἶτα αὕτη αὕτη πάσα ἡ εἰς Θεὸν ἀπιστία!* Ἀλλ' εἰ ἡ ἀπόδειξις τῆς ὑπάρξεως τοῦ Θεοῦ ἦν ὄντως ἀδύνατος (ἦν θέσιν ἀποδέχονται φεῦ ὡς καὶ ἀρχιερεῖς κατὰ σαφειστάτας αὐτῶν καὶ ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ δηλώσεις, οὐ δὲ καθηγηταὶ μόνοι· *πάντες ἄνευ τινὸς σαφοῦς ὀρισμοῦ ὁποίας ἀποδεκτῆς παρ' αὐτῶν ἀποδείξεως, δῆθεν ἐν τοῖς πράγμασιν ἀνυπάρκτου*, τῆς Ἐκείνου ὑπάρξεως), τοῦτο συνέβαινε ἂν διότι τοιαύτη ὄντως ἦν ἡ Πραγματικότης εἴτε διότι τοιαύτην ἠθέλησεν αὐτὴν ὁ Λόγος-Θεός, εἴτε διότι τοιαύτη ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς ἦν αὕτη ὥστ' ἀδύνατον καὶ τῷ Λόγῳ-Θεῷ μεταβαλεῖν ταύτην! Ἀποκλειομένης τῆς δευτέρας περι-

πτώσεως ὡς ἀντιβαινούσης πρὸς τὴν *Λογικωτάτην* ἀρχὴν τῆς Μιᾶς Μόνης Ἀρχῆς (ὅτι δύο τοιούτων οὐσῶν, *ἀδύνατός ἐστι Λογικῶς* ἡ ὑπεροχὴ τῆς μιᾶς ὑπὲρ τὴν ἑτέραν, κᾶρ' οὐδὲν δύναται συναγαγέσθαι ποτὲ *τελειωτικὸν ὁποῖον* συμπέρασμα, ὅπερ καθίστησιν *ἄσκοποι* οἱ ἀνδρήποτε πνευματικὴν ἀσχολίαν, πλὴν *πιθανῶς* τῶν ἀπαραιτήτων *πάντη ζῳόδους ὑπάρξεως*), τί ἀληθῶς λέγομεν δεχόμενοι οὕτως ἀναποφεύκτως ὡς ἀληθὴ τὴν πρώτην περίπτωσιν; *Οὐδὲν ἄλλο τούτου*. Ὅτι ἡ σωτηρία ἢ ἀπώλεια τῶν *δικαιουμένων Λογικῶς ἀμφιβάλλειν* (τουτέστι *πάντων ἡμῶν*), ἐν ὅφει τοῦ (πλέον δῆθεν ἐκ Θεοῦ) "*Λογικῶς ἀδυνάτου*" τῆς ἀποδείξεως τῆς ὑπάρξεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐστὶ ζήτημα διὰ μὲν ἡμᾶς *τυχαίας* ἐκλογῆς μιᾶς ἐκ τῶν δύο *Λογικῶς ἴσων πιθανοτήτων* ὑπάρξεως καὶ μὴ ὑπάρξεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, διὰ δὲ τὸν Θεὸν *κυβεύσεως* τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν καὶ κατὰ συνέπειαν *ἄρσεως πάσης ἀπαιτήσεως πίστεως εἰς τὴν Δικαιοσύνην Αὐτοῦ*! Τυχρὸν οὖν παίγνιον καὶ ἡ σωτηρία ἡμῶν, καὶ ἡ Θεία Δικαιοσύνη; Καὶ τοῦτο διὰ στόματος καθηγητῶν καὶ ἀρχιερέων (*προφανῶς μὴ κατανοούντων ἢ ἄρα πλήρως κατανοούντων* τί ἀληθῶς λέγουσιν); Οὐκ ἂρ' ἀρκεῖ ἡ πλήρης *ἐξαχρείωσις* τῆς κοινωνίας ἡμῶν καὶ διὰ τῆς *ἀκράτου κρατικῆς χρήσεως παντοίων λαχείων*, δι' ὧν τρέφεται, οὐ δὲ μὴν ἄλλ' ὡσαύτως καὶ *διαφθείρεται* καὶ τὸ κράτος καὶ οἱ μισθοὺς ἀπὸ τούτου λαμβάνοντες καὶ οἱ πολῖται αὐτοῦ πάντες, ἧς *δεινῆς* καταστάσεως πρό, ἢ ἐπίσημος "*κρατοῦσα*", *συνάρχουσα* καὶ τῷ συνάρχειν ἐπιμένουσα, καὶ κρατικούς μισθοὺς *καὶ ἐκ λαχείων* εἰσπράττουσα Ἐκκλησία αἰδημόνως(;), *ἀνεκρυφιάστως*, οὐδὲν λέγει, καὶ ὀφείλομεν νῦν *διὰ τοῦ κύβου* ἀποφασίσει ὡς καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν; Ἴδου τἀποτέλεσμα τῆς ἐπ' αἰῶνα μακροῦς *ἀσιτίας* τοῦ Πνεύματος καὶ τῆς *πεισματικῆς* ἐναντιώσεως τῶν ἑαυτοὺς ἐπὶ κεφαλῇ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ταξάντων κατὰ τοῦ *σὺν Θεῷ* Ὁρθοῦ Λόγου! *Οὐδεμίαν* εὐχαριστίαν ὀφείλομεν αὐτοῖς διὰ τοῦτο! Συνεκάλεσαν συνέδριον περὶ Ἐπιστήμης καὶ Ὁρθοδοξίας; Ἀφίεσαν τοὺς ὁμιλητὰς συμβαλεῖν τὴν συμβολὴν αὐτῶν ἐλευθέρως, ὡς πρωθυερεὺς τις ἐδήλωσεν; Ὅτι παρὰ τοῦτο, *οὐδὲν οὐσιῶδες* περὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Ἀνθρώπου ἐλέγχθη ἐν ταῖςδε ἡμέραις πνευματικῆς ἀγωνίας καὶ ἄγους, ὡς ἐν τῷ παρόντι ἐπιχειρεῖται, καὶ μόνον τὰ παγκοίνως γνῶστ' αὐθις ἀνεμασθήθη, *μόνην ὑποδηλοῖ τὴν ὑπ' αὐτῆς τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ὑπηρετουμένην μακρὰν ἀτροφίαν* τοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν Λόγου! Καὶ γὰρ "*πιστοὶ*" κατὰ τὸ ταύτης τεκμήριον ἦσαν πάντες οἱ ὁμιληταί, κᾶρ' ὡς *ἐγγιστα ἀσφαλεῖς περὶ τὸ οὐδὲν λέγειν δυσάρεστοι*! *Οὐδεὶς* κατὰ τὸ ταύτης τεκμήριον ὠμίλησεν ἄπιστος, καὶ *οὐδεμία* ἐπῆλθε συζήτησις τῶν ὁρίων καὶ ὅρων τῆς τε ἀπιστίας καὶ πίστεως! Φοβεραὶ αἱ κατηγορίαι; Ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ εἶδος τῶν ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ δηλώσεων! Καὶ φεῦ, οὐ κατὰ μόνas αὐτάς!

Πῶς οὖν ἐξάξομεν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς περισσῶς οὕτω καταδειχθείσης *δεινῆς* ταύτης θέσεως; Διὰ *μόνης* τῆς παραδοχῆς ὅτι· *προγινούς* τὰ ἐπερχόμενα ὁ Θεός, ἐν οἷς *χῆ* ὡς ἄνω τοῦ κόσμου μεταβολή, *χῆ* παροῦς' ἀπαίτησις *ἀπόδειξεως* τῆς ὑπάρξεώς Ἐκείνου, καὶ *τἀδύνατον* τῆς κατὰ τὴν Κρίσιν ἀπονομῆς τῆς Θείας Δικαιοσύνης ἄνευ τῆς νῦν ἀπαιτουμένης (προ)αποδείξεως· κατὰ τὴν Δημιουργίαν, *ἀκλόνητως* περιέλαβεν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ τὴν νῦν *ἀπαιτουμένην ἀπόδειξιν*! Ἦν τινες διὰ τὴν ἀΛογίαν αὐτῶν ἀνύπαρκτον λέγουσιν! Ἦν τινες διὰ τἀμέθοδον τῆς ἐρεύνης ἀδυνατοῦσιν εὐρεῖν! Ἦν τι-

νες καὶ καταδειχθεῖσαν περιφρονοῦσι τε κάποκρύπτουσιν, ἵνα μὴ ἀποκλίνω-
σιν ἀπὸ τῆς ἄρα πλέον ἐνσυνειδήτως παρ' αὐτῶν ἀκολουθουμένης παραΛό-
γου τε καὶ ἀντιθέου βλασφήμου οἰδοῦ!

Ζ. Ἐξαίρεσιν μερικὴν ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ ἀπετέλεσε μόνος ὁ Ἐπίσκοπος
Περγάμου, διαπορήσας μὲν διὰ μακρῶν περὶ τοῦ "τί ἐστὶν ὁ ἄνθρωπος" (ὅ-
περ περισσῶς κατεδείχθη ὡς ἄνω), καταφανεῖς ὅμως δὲ διὰ βραχέων κατα-
νοῶν ὅτι *μείζονα* διὰ τῶν μακρῶν αἰώνων ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀρχιερατεί-
ου διεπράχθησαν σφάλματα, ἅπερ καίτοι κατονομάσαι ἀπέφυγεν, ὅμως ἐζή-
τησεν ὅπως ἡ Ἐκκλησία θελήσῃ διορθῶσαι, ἀνασκευάσαι καὶ ἄραι! Ἄλλ' ὁ-
ψόμεθα τί αὕτη ποιήσει! Καὶ γὰρ ὁ καιρὸς μεγάλως ἐπείγει!

"Οἱ ἐπὶ δισχιλιετίαν ἡ Ἐκκλησία ὑπῆρξεν ὁ *μείζων*, κατὰ δὲ τὸ πλεί-
στον *μόνος*, τάνθρώπου διδάσκαλος! "Οἱ οὖν αὕτη θρηνεῖ διότι οὗτος ἔτι
ἐκπίπτει, ἐξετάστω τὴν ἐπιτυχίαν τοῦ ἰδίου αὐτῆς ἔργου! Πταίει μόνος ὁ
μαθητής; Ἡ *μειζόνως* καὶ ὁ διδάσκαλος, παραιτηθεὶς ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις ἀπὸ
τοῦ *μείζονος* αὐτοῦ ἔργου; Ἐξετάσωμεν τὴν δομὴν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἡμῶν
καὶ τὸ καθηγητικὸν αὐτῆς ἔργον! *Πέπτωκε κατασυντριβέν* τὸ Βυζάντιον, τὸ
καθ' ἡμᾶς καθόρισαν *δήθεν* "διὰ παντὸς" [ὅτι *οὐδὲν καινὸν φωτεινὸν* ἐπ' αἰ-
ῶνας μακροὺς ἔσχομεν λέγειν περὶ τῶν ἤδη ἀποδεχθέντων καὶ ἄλλων *ἀνε-
ρευνητῶν* πλην *ἀπαραιτήτων* δογμάτων] πάντα τὰ τῆς "Ὁρθῆς" εἰς Χριστὸν
καὶ Θεὸν πίστεως! Ἄλλ' ὡς *πέπτωκεν, πῶς ἂρ' ἀρεστὸν τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ πρὸς
ζωὴν ἣν ἅπαν τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ;* Συνεχόμεθα; Ὁ Κύριος *ἀπέστρεψεν* ἀπ' αὐ-
τοῦ τὴν προστασίαν Αὐτοῦ! Διότι *οὐδεὶς* κατισχύει τῶν *ὀρθῶς* καὶ *στερ-
ρῶς* μετ' Αὐτοῦ ἰσταμένων! Κατανοοῦμεν ποῦ ἄγει ἡ *πεισματικὴ* ἡμῶν *ἄρ-
νησις* (συνώνυμος οὖς' *ἀπιστίας* καὶ *ὑβρεως*) δεχθῆν' ὡς αἰτίαν τῆς πτώσε-
ως καὶ τὴν Θεῖαν ἀπαρέσκειαν καὶ τὰς *αἰτίας* αὐτῆς; Ἡ ἀμετανόητοι κἄσο-
φοι παραμένοντες *ἀρνούμενοι*, κἂν "Ὁρθόδοξους" ἑαυτοὺς ὀνομάζωμεν, ποι-
εῖν ὁ *ἔτι ἀφ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεὸς ἀναμένει*; Βλασφημεῖται καθ' ἡμέραν ὁ Κύριος·
μειζόνως δ' ὑπὸ τῶν *δήθεν* "Ὁρθόδοξον" πίστιν δηλούντων! Ὡς *χὸ ἀπιστος
κόσμος σέβεται τοὺς καθορωμένους ἀγίους*, ἂρ' ὅτι ἡμεῖς ὡς λαὸς ἐκλαμβά-
νομεν παρ' ἄλλοτρίων ἑαυτοὺς διωκομένους διὰ τὴν καταγωγὴν καὶ τὸ δόγ-
μα, *σιωπηρῶς* ὁμολογοῦμεν ὅπερ *διαρρήδην ἀρνούμεθα*: ὅτι *διαβιοῦμεν ἐν
περισσῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, οὐχ ἀγιότητι!* Συνεχόμεθα; *Οὐκ* αἰωνίως ἀνέξεται ἡμᾶς ὁ
Θεός, ὅτι ἡ αἰωνία ἀνοχὴ ταυτόσημος τῆς αἰωνίας ἀναβολῆς ἀποδόσεως Δι-
καιοσύνης· καὶ αὕτη τῆς αἰωνίας ἀδικίας! Συνεχόμεθα; Ἐτοιμάζομεν, *πῶς*,
τὴν ἀπολογία ἡμῶν; Κατὰ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ ἀρχιερατείου, ἡ Ἐκκλησία ἡμῶν
καταφαίνεται ἐνδιαφερομένη διὰ *μόνην* τὴν διατήρησιν *ἑαυτῆς ὡς κοινωνι-
κοῦ* θεσμοῦ-σώματος *ἀφῇ* ἀπτομένου, *ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ μέν, ὡς λέγεται, σκληροῦ
δέ, γραφειοκρατικοῦ-ἐξουσιαστικοῦ* τῆς κοσμικῆς κοινωνίας, κατὰ τὰ μέχρι
τοῦδε κρατήσαντα, ὡς ὄντως ἐστὶ καὶ πᾶς ἄλλος ὅμοιος. *Οὐδόλως κατα-
φαίνεθ' ὡς πνευματικὴ κοινωνία ζώντων πνευμάτων καθορωμένων* διὰ τῆς
ἀρίστης κατὰ πάντα ποιότητος πάντων τῶν λόγων καὶ ἔργων ἡμῶν τῶν δη-
λούντων ἑαυτοὺς μέλη αὐτῆς! Ὁρθοδοξία ἐστὶν οὐχὶ τὸ δοκεῖν ὀρθὰ ὅς' *ἀνε-
ξετάστως* δοκοῦμεν, ἀλλὰ *τόρῳ* δοκεῖν περὶ τὰ παρ' ἐκάστου ἡμῶν ἐξητα-
σμένα καὶ *πρέποντα εὐρεθέντα* (διότι *προσωπικὴ* οὐσα ἡ πίστις, καὶ *προσω-*

πικὴν ἄρ' ἀπαιτεῖ τὴν τ' ἐξέτασιν καὶ ἐπομένην ταύτης ἀπόφασιν περὶ πρέποντος, καὶ ἀπαγορεύει τὴν προσωπικὴν ἄνοιαν τῶν πιστευομένων πραγμάτων, ὡς ὅτι οὐδεμίαν ἐν αὐτῇ ἔχει θέσιν τὸ "ἂ εἶπον μοι, ταῦτα πιστεύω"! Καὶ τὰ πρέποντα οὐκ ἐστὶ δόγματα μόνα, ἀλλὰ καὶ ποιούμενα πράγματα, ἄλλως ἔργα! "Ὅτι δοκοῦμεν ἵνα κατὰ τὸ δόγμα βιώμεν καὶ βίος σημαίνει καὶ τὰ ποιούμενα ἔργα τάνάγοντα εἰς τὸ πιστευόμενον δόγμα! "Ἀρ' ἀχώριστος ἡ Ὁρθοδοξία ἀπὸ τῆς Ὁρθοπραξίας! Πῶς οὖν "Ὁρθόδοξοι" αὐταποκαλούμεθα ἐλάχιστα ἢ καὶ οὐδὲν Ὁρθὸν πράττοντες, καὶ τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρίστης ποιότητος; Πῶς ἱκανοποιούμεθα συγχαιρόμενοι διὰ τοῦ βλασφήμου λόγου τἀποκαλοῦντος ἡμᾶς "ἡυλογημένον λαὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ", κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν ὡς καὶ τοῦ λέγοντος ἐξηχρειωμένοι προσωπικὸν καὶ κοινωνικὸν βίον διάγοντες ναρκισσεύομενοι περὶ καταγωγῆς τε καὶ "πίστεως"; Οὐαὶ ἡμῖν, εἰ οὐ συνεχόμεθα! Εἰ οὐ κατανοοῦμεν καὶ τοῦτο θάπλου: ὅτι ἡ Ἐκκλησία οὔτε καθιδρύθη ὡς κοινωνικὴ τις παράταξις-σῶμα-ὑπηρεσία δι' αὐτοσυντήρησιν ἐπ' ὠφελείᾳ μελῶν ὡς πᾶς ἄλλος ὁργανισμὸς τούτου τοῦ κόσμου, οὔτ' ἀπολογηθήσθ' ὡς κοινωνικὸν σῶμα διὰ τὸ ἔργον αὐτῆς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς Κρίσεως! Μόνοι ἡμεῖς! Ἐκαστος ἡμῶν κεχωρισμένως, διὰ τὰ ἔργ' αὐτοῦ τὰ γεγενημένα! Συνεχόμεθα; Ἐτοιμάζει οὖν ἄρ' ἡμᾶς πρὸς ἀπολογίαν ἡ Ἐκκλησία; Ἀσφαλῶς ὑπάρχουσιν ἄπλοῖ, ἀπλοῖκοι ἄνθρωποι, μέγα τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν, χρῆζοντες σωτηρίας. Ἀλλὰ πλεον αὐξάνει ταχέως τὸ πλῆθος τῶν "μορφωμένων", τῶν χρωμένων καὶ τῆς διανοίας αὐτῶν, τῶν ἀγωνιζομένων τηρῆσ' ἑαυτοὺς ὀρθοῦς, ἀκεραίους, μακρὰν διαιρέσεων καὶ τῆς "λαϊκῆς" ἀγορᾶς τῶν κακῶν ἕως αἰσχρῶν "ἐπιχειρημάτων" πανταχόθεν προβαλλομένων, τῶν ἀληθῶς sophisticated people! Ἐνδιαφέρεται πῶς ἡ Ἐκκλησία καὶ δι' αὐτούς; Πλὴν τοῦ ἀπαιτεῖν παρ' αὐτῶν ἐγκαταλιπεῖν τὴν χρῆσιν τῆς διανοίας αὐτῶν, ὡς πρώτου ὅρου δῆθεν ἀπαραιτήτου ἵν' ἀνοιγῶσιν οἱ "ψυχικοὶ" αὐτῶν ὀφθαλμοί, πῶς ἀπεργάζεθ' ἡ Ἐκκλησία καὶ τούτων τὴν σωτηρίαν; Μὴν ἐνεργοῦσα ὡς ἐνεργεῖ καὶ ἀπαιτοῦσα ὃ ἀπαιτεῖ, ἀνεπιτρέπτως πολλὰ ἀπαιτεῖ παρ' αὐτῶν; Καὶ γὰρ εἶπομεν ὅτι ἐνιαῖον κἀδιαίρετον τὸ Πνεῦμα, καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου! Καὶ γὰρ πολυτιμότεον τάλαντον ἐκ Θεοῦ πρὸς ἐπαύξησιν, κἀναπόσπαστον τοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν Πνεύματος μέρος ἐστὶν ἐκάστου ἡμῶν ἡ διάνοια! Ὅτι διακρίνομεν δι' ὅρων ὡς πνεῦμα, διάνοια, νοῦς, ψυχὴ, ἢ καρδία, οὐδόλως σημαίνει ὅτι ἔξεστιν ἡμῖν διαιρεῖν τὸ ἐν ἀδιαίρετον ἐν ἡμῖν Πνεῦμα! Πρὸς διάκρισιν τῶν λειτουργιῶν αὐτοῦ ἵστανται οὗτοι οἱ ὅροι, οὐχὶ πρὸς διαίρεσιν εἰς δῆθεν κεχωρισμέν' ἀπ' ἀλλήλων πνευματικὰ ὄντα μυστηριωδῶς πῶς ἐν ἡμῖν κατοικοῦντα τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀδιαιρέτου ἐν ἡμῖν Λόγου! Εἰ παραιτούμενους ἀπὸ τῆς διανοίας ἡμῶν ἐπεθύμει ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεός, ἄνευ αὐτῆς ἐποίει ἡμᾶς ἄν! Ὅτι οὐδὲν περιττὸν ποιεῖ ὁ Θεός! Καὶ κενόν, κακὸν καὶ βλάσφημόν ἐστὶ τὸ ὑπὸ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ὑποβαλλόμενον καινοφανὲς δόγμα ὅτι ἡ διάνοια ἵστατ' ἐν ἡμῖν ὡς τὸ ἐν παραδείσῳ ξύλον γνώσεως καλοῦ καὶ κακοῦ, ἀφ' οὗ ἀπηγόρευθ' ἡμῖν δρέπειν καρπούς! Τάνόητον ἱερατεῖον διέσπασεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τὴν μίαν Ἐκκλησίαν Χριστοῦ, παρὰ τὰς παραινήσεις τοῦ Παύλου! Οὐκ ἐπιτρέψομεν αὐτῷ νῦν διασπᾶν καὶ τὴν προσωπικότητα αὐτοῦ γε τάνθρώπου, ἥς χάριν ὁ Κύριος ἔσταυρώθη—ὑπὸ τοῦ τότε δ' ἱερατείου, μὴ λησμονώμεν! Ἀμαρτάνει οὖν μεγάλως

λως ἡ Ἐκκλησία ἀπαιτοῦσα παρ' ἡμῶν θάψαι τό πνεῦμα ἡμῶν καὶ θρέψαι μόνην ὅτε μὲν τὴν "καρδίαν" ὅτε δὲ τὴν "ψυχὴν" ἡμῶν, *δῆθεν* ἵνα οὕτω *πα-
ραφρονούντες* σωθῶμεν!

Καίτοι βλασφημούμενος, ὁ Θεὸς ἔτι ἀναμένει πλείονα παρ' ἡμῶν! Τὸ μέχρι τοῦδε κατ' Ἐκκλησίαν καθῆκον *προφανῶς οὐκ ἀρκεῖ*, ὥς ὅτι τὸ μέρος τῆς Θείας Σοφίας ὃ οφείλομεν πρὸ τῆς Κρίσεως κατακτῆσαι οὐκ ἐξηντήθη! Κὰς τὴν ἀνακάλυψιν τῆς οὐσίας τῶν πλειόνων ἅ ἀφ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεὸς ἀναμένει προφανῶς οὐκ ἀρκεῖ τὸ κατ' ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παράδοσιν "ἔργον", μάλ' ἥσσανα τῆς ἀπαιτουμένης χρήσιν τῆς διανοίας ποιῆσαν!

Ὁ κόσμος ἐνοποιεῖται! Ἀντὶ τοῦ χαίρειν ἐπὶ τούτῳ χαρὰν μεγάλην ἡ Ἐκκλησία, *ψευδῶς* προσευχομένη "ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν πάντων ἐνώσεως" *ἀκλονή-
τως ἐπὶ τῇ διαιρέσει* καὶ τῶν πιστῶν αὐτῆς καὶ τοῦ κόσμου ἐμμένει [δι' ὃ καὶ "γραφεῖα" τε καὶ μετόχια *πρὸς ἄγραν "πιστῶν" καὶ χρημάτων* ἢ μία ἐντὸς τῆς ἄλλης ἐπιμένει ἀνοίγειν] πρὸς *δόξαν μόνην τῶν ἐαυτῆς δεσποτῶν, οὐ τοῦ Χριστοῦ!* Καὶ ἠνέωχθησαν τὰ πύλωτ' αὐτῶν στόματα καὶ διεφάνη ἐν ταῖσδε τελευταίαις ἡμέραις φόβῳ μεγάλῳ διακατεχομένη ἡ αἰτία τῆς ἐπ' αἰῶνας συναπτοῦς εἴκοσι διαμάχης αὐτῶν, *ἥτις αἰεὶ ἦν περὶ τὰ πρωτεῖα*, ἀλλ' *οὐκ ἐξ ἀγιοτήτος τῶν θραυστάτων "ἀγιοτήτων"* αὐτῶν, ἀλλ' ἐξ "ἱστορικῶν θέσεων"· ὥς κατακρατεῖν ἐπιμένουσι παρότι εἰσὶ δέσμιοι ἀλλοθρήσκοις, καὶ μετ' αὐτῶν εἰσὶ δέσμιοι καὶ οἱ κείνας κατέχοντες, *κείμεν ἀδυνατοῦντες ὑποῦν ἐλίκρινῃ φωνῇ πίστεως*· περὶ οὐ πάντως ἀδιαφοροῦσιν ἐμμένοντες ἐν αὐταῖς διὰ τὰ πρωτεῖα, παρότι οὐδὲν οὐσιῶδες ἐπ' αἰῶνας μακροῦς ἐκείθεν προσφέρουσι ἔργον σωτηρίας ἀνθρώπων καὶ προαγωγῆς τοῦ διὰ τοῦ κόσμου σκοποῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ! Ἡ Ἐκκλησία, ἐπιτραπήτῳ ὁ ὅρος, φωνασκεῖ ἢ καὶ *ῥύεται!* Ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ Αὐτοῦ ὥρισεν ὁ Θεὸς ὅπως καὶ διὰ τῆς ἐνοποιήσεως τοῦ κόσμου ἐτοιμασθῇ ἡ ἀπολογία ἐκάστου ἡμῶν! Συνεχόμεθα; Κατανοεῖ τι τῶν συντελουμένων καὶ ἐπερχομένων εἴτε ἡ Ἐκκλησία εἴτε ἡ Πολιτεία ἡμῶν; Ἀντιλαμβάνεται τὴν *Λογικὴν ἀνάγκην* τῆς διὰ τῶν παγκοσμίως συντελουμένων *ἐτοιμασίας τῆς Κρίσεως*; Ἀντιλαμβάνεται τὴν *Λογικὴν ἀνάγκην* τῆς ἐτοιμασίας διὰ τὴν Κρίσιν τοῦ κόσμου παντὸς διὰ μόνης τῆς ἀπὸ θέσεως ἐν παντὶ ἐλευθέρως Ὁρθῆς διδασκαλίας αὐτῆς, κεκαθαρμένης ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν αὐτῇ ἀνορθοδόξου συσσωρεύματος τῶν αἰώνων; Πῶς καλῶς πορεύετ' ἐπὶ τὰ πρόσω βλέπουσα συνεχῶς πρὸς τὰ παρελθόντα;

Ἡ Κρίσις, ἐπερχομένη, *οὐκ ἔσεται γεγονὸς μείζον* τῆς Ἀναστάσεως! Ἡ κρίσις τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ ἡμῶν κόσμου *οὐκ ἔσεται μείζων τῆς ἤδη συντελεσθείσης* Νίκης τοῦ Κυρίου ἐπὶ τοῦ κακοῦ! Ὁ Κύριος οὐκ ἐψεύσθη εἰπὼν ὅτι ἡγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ νῦν αὕτη ἐπὶ θύραις! Μόνη ἡ Ἐκκλησία, δυτικάσιατικῶς προσκεκολλημένη τοῖς ὅροις τούτου τοῦ κόσμου (καὶ γὰρ καθορώμεν περὶ τίνα πατροπαράδοτῶς αὕτη τυρβάζει), *μὴ κρούουσα καὶ μὴ αἰτοῦσα, ἀπέτυχεν* ἐρευνῆσαι καὶ διαπιστῶσαι τὸν τρόπον ἀληθείας καὶ τοῦ καιριωτάτου αὐτοῦ λόγου, οὐδέποτε μέχρι τοῦ νῦν κατανοήσασα πῶς ἡ ἀποτυχία αὐτῆς αὕτη, *ἐγκαταλιποῦσα ἔκθετον τὸν Χριστόν, συνέβαλεν* εἰς τὴν ἐγκαθίδρυσιν τῆς ἀμφιβολίας, τὴν ἀνάπτυξιν τῆς ἀπιστίας, τὴν γιγάντωσιν τῆς ἀσεβείας, ἅρ' ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ιδίων αὐτῆς κόλπων! Ἀπὸ τῆς Σταυρώσεως καὶ τῆς Ἀναστάσεως, ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐκέτι πλέον ἐστὶν ἐπὶ

θύραις, ἀλλ' ἐντὸς τῆς οἰκίας! Μόν' ἡμεῖς, οἱ ὅλως ἀνόητοι ἐξ αἰτίας τῆς αὐτεπιβληθείσης ἡμῖν ἀχρησίας τῆς διανοίας ἡμῶν ἀπετύχομεν κατανοεῖν ὅτι ἤδη ἀπὸ τότε κρινόμεθα, ὅτι ἀκριβῶς αὕτη ἔστιν ἡ Κρίσις, πρῶτον αὐτὴ στάδιον τῆς τότε ἐπελθούσης Θεοῦ βασιλείας, καθ' ὃ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ γε τοῦ φοβεροῦ Βήματος καλούμεθα καὶ συμπληρῶσαι τὸ παρ' ἡμῶν ἀπαιτούμενον σὺν τῇ διανοίᾳ ἡμῶν ἐπιτελεσθήσεσθ' ὑπολειπόμενον ἔργον καὶ ἀπολογηθῆναι διὰ τὸν βίον ἡμῶν! Τί ποιοῦμεν ἐνώπιον τοῦ φοβεροῦ Βήματος καθορᾶται παρὰ πάντων δι' ἡμέρας τε καὶ νυκτός! Ὁρθοδόξους ἑαυτοὺς λέγομεν; Πῶς οὖν οὐ καθορῶμεν τὸ μέγα πρὸ ἡμῶν ἔργον; Ἴδε τὴν "Ὁρθοδοξίαν" ἡμῶν, κενῶν κενῶς μεγαλαυχούντων! Ἄλλ' ὁ Κύριος οὐ μυκτηρίζεται! Ἱερατεῖον τε καὶ λαός: Συνεχόμεθα;

Η. Φόβω μεγάλῳ κατεχομένη πρὸ τῶν φοβερῶν προκλήσεων τῶνδε καιρῶν, ἡ Ἐκκλησία ἡμῶν κρυπτομένη ὀπισθεν τῆς δῆθεν "Ὁρθοδοξίας" φαίνεται ἐπιστρέφουσα εἰς τὸ σκοτεινότερον αὐτῆς παρελθόν, τὴν ἀδιάκοπον καὶ ἀλόγιστον δημοσίαν λατρείαν τῶν συμβόλων μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὴν καὶ ἄλλοτε ποτε τόσα δεινὰ προκαλέσασαν καὶ αὖθις νῦν ἐμφανιζομένην ὡς δῆθεν ἐκφράζουσιν (κατὰ τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ἡμῶν) τὴν πεμπτουσίαν τῆς "πίστεως" (ἀλλ' οὐ τῆς Ὁρθῆς ἐπὶ τῷ Ἐνὶ-Πνεύματι-Προσώπῳ-Λόγῳ-Ζῶντι-Θεῷ Πίστewς, περὶ οὗ τε καὶ ἥς οὐδὲν ἀπολύτως ἀκούεται ἀπ' αὐτῆς) τῶν ἀνθρώπων! Ἥτις ὥφειλεν ἀσφαλῶς παραμένειν κρυφία ἐν τῷ ἐσωτάτῳ προσώπῳ ἐκάστου ἡμῶν κοινωνία μετὰ τοῦ ὀντολογικῶς μόνον Ἀρρήτου, Λογικῶς ὅμως κατανοούμενου, καὶ ψυχολογικῶς ἀπρεπῶς ὑποκαθίσταμένου δι' ὑποκαταστάτων Θεοῦ, ἐν ταῖςδε ἡμέραις, πάντων ἡμῶν μαρτυρούντων, γίνεται δημόσιον πρὸς βορὰν θέαμα, κοινὴ τοῦ δήμου παραίσθησις καὶ παραφορά, αἰσχρὸν καὶ ψευδέστατον ἐπὶ κοσμικῇ κυριαρχίᾳ πολιτικὸν καὶ δῆθεν θρησκευτικὸν "ἐπιχείρημα", καὶ εὐκαιρία πρὸς χονδρὸν γέλωτα τῶν αὐτόθι ἀντιφρονούντων καὶ ἄλλοθι παρατηρούντων τὰ πανταχόθι συμβαίνοντα! Ἐμπνευστὴς καὶ πρωτοστάτης δ' αὐτῶν ἡ "Ὁρθόδοξος" ἡμῶν Ἐκκλησία! Ἀπόδειξις ἀκαταμάχητος κάπερίφραστος τῆς πλήρους ἀνυπαρξίας πάσης πλὴν ψευδομένης πνευματικῆς-φιλοσοφικῆς-Θεολογικῆς ὁδηγήσεως τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ τοῦ τόπου! Ἀποτέλεσμα τῆς ἐπὶ δεκαετίας μακρὰς καταδημαγωγῆσεως τοῦ λαοῦ διὰ ψευδῶν "λαοκρατικῶν" συνθημάτων ποικιλομόρφων ἐν ὑψηλοῖς, ἀφ' ὑψηλοῦ ἀγρευόντων ἐν ἀγοραῖς ὁπαδούς τε πρὸς δόξαν καὶ τοὺς αὐτῶν θήλακας πρὸς ὠφέλειαν! Παρουσιαζόντων τὸν "εὐκόλον" (ἄρα, δι' ἀσφαλοῦς κλοπῆς καὶ ἀπάτης) τρόπον ἀποκτήσεως ἀγαθῶν ὡς λαϊκὸν "κεκτημένον" δικαίωμα! Ἡ Ἐκκλησία ἀρνεῖται καταστηλιτεῖν ἐπωνύμως τὰ συντελούμενα ὡς ἀσυγχώρητον παραλογισμόν καὶ Θεοῦ βλασφημίαν καὶ ὕβριν τιμωρηθησομένην μεγάλως! Οἱ δὲ κακοποιοί, ἄρ' οὖν ἀσφαλεῖς, συνεχίζουσιν ἔτι θρασύτεροι, ἀνενόχλητοι καὶ γελῶντες! Ἀπολούμεθ' ὡς λαὸς καὶ ὡς ἄνθρωποι, ἂν οὐκ ἀναστείλωμεν τὴν πορείαν ἡμῶν ταύτην ἐπὶ τὸ μηδέν, τὸ ὀρίζον τὸ τέρμα πάσης ἐπὶ τὰ ἀεὶ ἥσσονα προσπαθείας! Ἄλλ' οἱ ἐν ὑψηλοῖς δημόσιοι θρησκευτικοί, νομικοί, πολιτικοί, πολιτειακοί ἡμῶν ἄνδρες, ὁδεύοντες ἐν δημαγωγίᾳ τὴν "ἀσφαλῇ" πλὴν λείαν πεπατημένην, οὐδέποθ' ὁμολογήσουσιν ὅτι παρεξέτρεψαν τὸν λαὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὁρθοῦ Δρόμου,

καταλιπόντες αὐτὸν ἄνευ ἐμπνεύσεως! Ἡ μέχρι τοῦδε σιωπῶσα ἀλλὰ τὰ πάντα παρατηροῦσα Ἀκαδημία τοῦ ἔθνους, πρὸς ἣν ἅπασαν δι' ὑμῶν τὸ παρὸν ἀπευθύνεται, συνοδικῶς ὀφείλει ἀναλαβεῖν τὴν ὁδηγεσίαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ κόσμου! Ἐστω ἡ παροῦσα εἰσήγησις πτωχὴ τις παραίνεσις εἰς τάληθῶς μέγα παρ' αὐτῆς ἀναμενόμενον ἔργον!

Προσηκόντως,

Υ. Γ. Προέλαβέ μ' ἐν τῷδε σημείῳ ὁ ἀπολογισμὸς τῆς κατὰ τὰ φαινόμενα φορτικῶς διὰ πολιτικούς, οὐ θρησκευτικούς, λόγους ἐπιβληθείσης ἐπισκέψεως τοῦ Πατριάρχου. *Ψευδέστατοι* ἀπεδείχθησαν οἱ μετὰ τοῦ ἐνταῦθ' Ἀρχιεπισκόπου ἐναγκαλισμοί! Ὁ πρῶτος ἠῦρε τὸν χρόνον ἐπισκέψασθ' ὥς καὶ αἰγοτροφεία! Οἱ δύο ὁμοῦ οὐχ ἠῦρον τὸν χρόνον κοινὴν *Εὐχαριστίαν* καὶ *Δοξολογίαν* ἀναπέμψαι *Θεῷ*, ἐγγιζομένῳ μόνον στόματι, τιμωμένῳ μόνον χερίλεσι, *δραττομένῳ* τοὺς σοφοὺς ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτῶν! **And as for the many still outstanding problems of Faith, not a word!** Ὡς ὠραίους ἔχομεν νῦν πνευματικούς διδασκάλους! Φιλοδοξοῦντας (ἀλλ' οὐκ *εὐγενῶς ἀνταγωνιζομένους ἀλλήλους* περὶ τὸ) παραμένειν ἐπὶ κεφαλῇς τοῦ πανταχόθι Ἑλληνισμοῦ καὶ Ὁρθόδοξου Χριστιανισμοῦ! Δοκοῦντας κατέχειν Ἀλήθειαν! Ὁ Πατριάρχης *φοβεῖται* τὴν ἐν Ἀγίῳ Ὅρει μετεγκατάστασιν *δῆθεν* ἵνα μὴ ἀπολεσθῇ ἡ "οἰκουμενικότης"! Ἦτις ὅμως περιορίζεται πλέον εἰς ἀνὰ τὸν κόσμον *ἀνούσια* περὶ τὴν οἰκολογίαν ταξίδια, οὐχὶ τὴν παραγωγὴν *νέου φιλοΣοφικοῦ-Θεολογικοῦ λόγου ἐνδιαφέροντος παγκοσμίως*, ἢ ἔστω τὸν κατὰ τὸν *παιαὶὸν τρόπον* εὐαγγελισμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ-Λόγου! Φοβεῖτ' ἐπίσης μὴ περιέλθῃ εἰς τὴν Μόσχαν ἢ "ἡγεσίαν" τῆς Ὁρθοδοξίας! Ἰν' ἀποφύγῃ δὲ τοῦτο, *προτιμᾷ* παραμένειν πιστὸς Τούρκος πολίτης, καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ προτιμώμεν(;) χῆμεις τὴν ὑπὸ τῶν Τούρκων *φίμωσιν* τοῦ Ὁρθόδοξου Χριστιανικοῦ Λόγου [ὥς ὅτι *ἔτι ἀνατολῖται, οὐκ Ὁρθόδοξοι, πάλιν αὐτοὺς* φαινόμεθα ἐπιλέγοντες *ἢ τοὺς "ἀπίστους" τῆς Δύσεως*· ὦν τῆς φιλοξενίας εἰς τοὺς τόπους αὐτῶν πολλοὶ *ἐξ ἡμῶν καταχρῶνται ὥς ἀδιόρθωτοι μέτοικ' ἀνατολῖται*, καὶ ὦν τὰ εὐρήματα *ἐξ "ἀπίστου"* ἐπιστημονικῆς ἐργασίας καὶ δῶρα *ἐξ ὑστερήσεως* οἱ *πλείστοι δῆθεν "πιστοὶ"* *ἐξ ἡμῶν ἀπαιτοῦσιν ἀσιγήτως* καὶ ἀσυγγνώστως, καὶ λαμβάνουσιν ἀπλήστως καὶ ἀγνωμόνως]! Ἡ πρώτη μεταξὺ Παλαιᾶς καὶ Νέας Ῥώμης ῥῆξις προῆλθεν ἐκ τῆς ἀπαιτήσεως τῆς δευτέρας ἀναλαβεῖν τὰ ἐν τῇ μιᾷ Ἐκκλησίᾳ *πρωτεῖα* διὰ τὸ ταύτης πολυπληθέστερον! Τὸ τότε διὰ τὰ *πρωτεῖα* "καλὸν" δοκηθέν πλὴν *διχαστικὸν* τοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ "ἐπιχείρημα" χάριν τῶν *πρωτείων* νῦν λησμονεῖται! Καὶ χρῆσις ποιεῖται τῆς "Ἱερᾶς Παράδοσεως" διὰ τὰ *πρωτεῖα*! Ὡν χάριν *ἀπαιτεῖται* παρ' ἡμῶν λησμονεῖν τὸν χρόνον καὶ τρόπον ἰδρύσεως τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν, καὶ ὑποτάσσεσθαι τῇ "μητρί", καὶν Τούρκους νῦν ὑποτασσομένη! Χάριν τῶν *πρωτείων*, ὁ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ αὐτεμφανιζόμενος ὥς "πρῶτος Ὁρθόδοξος" ἀρνεῖται τὴν ἐν ἡρεμίᾳ *προσευχὴν* καὶ *παραγωγὴν Λόγου*, καὶ τὸν διὰ τούτου

τοῦ τρόπου δυσκόλως μὲν κτώμενον ἀλλὰ μὴ δ' ἀφαιρούμενον παγκόσμιον σεβασμόν!

Ἄλλ' ἢ ὡς ἄνω τοῦ Πατριάρχου ἀπαίτησις ἀφεύκτως ἐνέχει καὶ τοῦτο, ὅπερ μόνον ἀσυγχωρήτως ἀνοηταίνοντες παραβλέπομεν. Πάντα τὰ ἐξ ὅ,που γῆς Ἑλλήνων καὶ λοιπῶν Ὀρθοδόξων χρηματικά πρὸς τὸ Πατριαρχεῖον ἐμβάσματα συναλλάγματος περιέρχονται αὐτομάτως εἰς τὴν διαχείρισιν καὶ χρῆσιν τοῦ τουρκικοῦ κράτους! Ὁ χρῆται αὐτοῦ δι' ἀγορὰν ὀπλων κατὰ τῆς Ἑλλάδος! Ὅποια ἀληθῶς ἡ ἡμετέρα σοφία καὶ εὐφυΐα! Τοῦ ἔθνους παντὸς καὶ τῶν τούτου ἀρχόντων!

Περὶ δὲ τὴν "αἴφνης ἀνακύψασαν" (ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῶν πλείστων πολιτικῶν καὶ τῶν τούτων παντοίων συνεργατῶν δολίως μηχανευθείσαν, ἵνα στομώσωσι τὴν κατ' αὐτῶν κατηγορίαν τῆς διαφθορᾶς) νέαν "συζήτησιν" περὶ τοῦ "τίς δικαιοῦται φέρειν τὴν σημαίαν τοῦ ἔθνους" (καὶ ἐν ἄλλαις τισὶ περιπτώσεσι, καὶ κυρίως ἐν ἐορταῖς ἐπ' ἀναμνήσει τῶν κατ' εἰσβολέων ἀγώνων αὐτοῦ) τοῦτο πρῶτον δεῖ ἡμᾶς ἐρωτᾶν: Ἔστιν, ἢ οὐ, ἡ ἐν μάχῃ σηματοφορία ταυτόσημος τῆς ὑπὸ παντὸς τοῦ στρατεύματος προασπίσεως τῆς σημαίας ὡς συμβόλου τοῦ ἔθνους, μαχομένου κατ' ἄλλοτρίων; Ἔστιν οὖν ἄρα, ἢ οὐ, ἡ ὑπὸ παίδων ἐν ἐορταῖς σηματοφορία κείνου ὑπόμνησις, καὶ ἄσκησις καὶ ἐτοιμασία αὐτῶν πρὸς ἐκεῖνο τὸ μείζον; Τί γὰρ δοκοῦσιν οἱ παρόντες τοῦ ἔθνους πολιτικοί, ὧν τινες οὐδ' ὑπηρέτησαν ἐνόπλως αὐτό: ὅτι ἀσήμαντον θέατρον κατὰ τὰς διαταγὰς αὐτῶν συγκροτούμενόν ἐστιν ἡ σηματοφορία;

Ἦκούσαμεν τὸν Πρόεδρον τῆς Δημοκρατίας ἀναφέρεισθ' εἰς τὸ παρ' Ἰσοκράτους ῥηθέν. Ἐρωτᾶται: Ἦν ποτ' ἐν ἀρχαιότητι ἀληθὲς ὅτι πᾶς τῆς Ἑλλήνων παιδείας μετέχων ἦν αὐτομάτως καὶ ὑποχρεωτικῶς διὰ τοῦτο καὶ πολίτης τῆς πόλεως ἐν ᾗ διεβίοντο; Αἱ ἀρχαῖαι ἐλληνικαὶ πόλεις πλέον τῶν πολιτῶν εἶχον ἐπίσης μετοίκους (Ἕλληνας καὶ ἄλλοδαπούς) καὶ δούλους (μὴ Ἕλληνας). Οἱ παροικοῦντες ἄλλοδαποὶ καὶ οἱ δούλοι προφανῶς διὰ τοῦ τῆς πόλεως βίου μετεῖχον τῆς γενικῶς πᾶσι παρεχομένης Ἑλλήνων παιδείας! Ἀλλὰ πάντες οἱ μέτοικοι (οὐ δὲ μόν' οἱ ἄλλοδαποὶ) οὐκ ἦσαν πολῖται, οὐκ εἶχον τὰ εἰδικὰ τῶν πολιτῶν δικιώματα, οὐκ ἐπολέμουν ὑπὲρ τῶν πόλεων, καὶ ἐν πολέμων καιροῖς μείζονας πρὸς ἄμυναν κατέβαλον φόρους! Περὶ δὲ τῶν δούλων, πᾶσα ὑπόμνησις περιττεύει! Πόθεν οὖν ἀντλεῖ ἄρα ὡς καὶ ὁ Πρόεδρος(!) ἐν ταῖσδε δυσσιώνοις ἡμέραις τὸ παρ' αὐτοῦ διδαχθὲν καθαρώτατον ψεῦδος ὅτι δῆθεν "πᾶς τῆς Ἑλλήνων παιδείας μετέχων δικαιούται φέρειν (ἀλλ' οὐχ ὑποχρεοῦται καὶ προασπίζεσθαι) τὴν σημαίαν τοῦ ἔθνους", ὡς διατείνεται τὸ μέγα παρ' ἡμῖν πλῆθος γελοίων "διανοουμένων", συνεχῶς παρ' αὐτοῦ ἀπαιτούντων ὑπηρεσίας ἀλλ' οὐδέποτε πρὸς αὐτὸ ὁμολογούντων ὑποχρεώσεις; Τί κοινὸν ἔχουσιν αὐτοὶ πάντες μετὰ τῶν ἄλλα βιωσάντων ἀρχαίων Ἑλλήνων; Ἔστι τις ἐντροπὴ ἐν αὐτοῖς; Φαντάζεται ἄρα ὁ Πρόεδρος, ἢ πᾶς ἄλλος πολιτικὸς τῆσδε κακῆς ὥρας, στρατιώτην ἐλληνικὴν στολὴν φέροντα, τὴν σημαίαν φυλάσσοντα, πλὴν ἄλλοδαπὸν τῇ ψυχῇ διαμένοντα, ῥιπτόμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἱεροῦ Βράχου χάριν τῆς ἔθνους τιμῆς, καὶ ἐν ἀγκάλαις πολυτιμοτάτην κρατοῦντα τὴν τοῦδ' ἔθνους θρασύτητα νῦν ὑπὸ πολιτικῶν καὶ "διανοουμένων" προσβαλλομένην σημαίαν; Πῶς οὐκ ἐστὶ μέγεθος τῆς αὐτῶν ἐντροπῆς;

Πὼς ὁ Πρόεδρος ἀγνοεῖ δημοσίως ὅπερ γινώσκει ὅτι οὐδεὶς κάλλιον τοῦ Ἰσοκράτους ὠμίλησε περὶ τῆς γηγενείας τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ τῆς ἐνώσεως αὐτῶν πάντων διὰ τὴν κρείττονα προάσπιν τῆς Ἑλλάδος κατὰ τῶν ἀπειλούντων αὐτὴν ἀλλοτριῶν; Καὶ πὼς οὖν ἄρα φευξόμεθ' ἀπὸ τοῦ συνειρμού (μὴ διαφεύγοντος ἀπὸ παντὸς ξένου στενῶς παρατηροῦντος ἡμᾶς διὰ τὸ κείνου συμφέρον!) ὅτι τὸ καινοφανὲς Προεδρικὸν "ἐπιχείρημα" οὐ μόνον ἐστὶ παντελῶς ἀνιστόρητον, ἀλλ' ἐστὶ καὶ αἰσχρόν, ἀποδεικνὺν αὐτὸν ἀσυνγχερώτως παραποιῶντα χάριν ὠφελημάτων τῆς τάξεως τῶν πολιτικῶν τὴν ἱστορίαν τοῦ ἔθνους, ὅπερ καὶ αὐτὸς νῦν τίθησιν ἐν προφανεστάτῳ κινδύνῳ διὰ τῆς τοιαύτης "διδασκαλίας";

Μὴ δ' ἔχον ἀρχαίαν καταγωγὴν τὸ "ἐπιχείρημα" τοῦτο, ἐπὶ ποίου ἄρα συγχρόνου ἐλληνικοῦ ἢ ξένου νόμου ἐρείδεται; Ἐπὶ μόνῃς ὑπουργικῆς ἀποφάσεως; Τίς ἐδίδου τοῖς ὑπουργοῖς ἡμῶν τὸ δικαίωμα κάπὶ τοιούτων θεμάτων, καθαπτομένων τῆς διαχρονικῆς ὑποστάσεως τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ὀριστικῶς ἀποφθέγγεσθαι; Τίς τῶν ὑπουργῶν κατέχει, παντὸς τοῦ ἔθνους ὁμολογούντος, τὴν λεπτότητα, τὴν ἀγωγὴν, τὸν νοῦν, τὴν γνῶσιν, τὴν παιδείαν, τὴν σοφίαν, τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὸ θάρρος τῆς Ἀληθείας τοῦ Λόγου ὥστε δεσμευτικῶς δι' αὐτὸ ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἀποφθέγγεσθαι; Ἐν τίνι χώρᾳ ἑτέρα ἀνάλογόν τι συμβαίνει; Ἐν τῷ παρόντι καιρῷ, τοιαύτης ὡς νῦν οὔσης τῆς τῆς γνώσεως διαχύσεως, πᾶς τις δύναται οἰασθήποτε παιδείας, ἢ καὶ πλειόνων, μακρόθεν μετέχειν! Μὴ διὰ τοῦτο ὀφείλομεν, καὶ ὀφείλει πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, ἀναγνωρίζειν ὡς πολίτας τοὺς μετέχοντας μὲν κατ' ἰδίαν αὐτῶν δῆλωσιν τῆς "παιδείας", ὅμως δ' οὐδόλως μετέχοντας τῶν κοινῶν κόπων, ἰδαικῶν, πνευματικῶν ὁραμάτων, νόμων, ζωῆς, θυσιῶν ἕως θανάτου, καὶ πίστεως εἰς τὸ κοινὸν πνευματικὸν πεπρωμένον τῶν πολιτῶν, πάνθ' ἅπερ κατὰ τὸ τόθ' Ἑλλήνων παράδειγμα συνέστησε τὴν "Ἑλλήνων παιδείαν", πάνθ' ἅπερ νῦν ὁμῶς περιφρονεῖται σκαιῶς ὑπὸ τῶν δῆθεν "διανοουμένων" τῆσδ' ἀποφράδος ἡμέρας; Κεινῶτατον οὖν ἄρα τὸ προταθὲν "ἐπιχείρημα"!

Ἡ μήπως ἄρα καὶ τοῦτο συμβαίνει, ὅτι δηλαδὴ οἱ παρόντες πολιτικοὶ θεωροῦσι τὴν ἐγνωσμένης παρὰ πάντων ποιότητος παρ' αὐτῶν τοῖς παισὶ νῦν παρεχομένην "παιδείαν" ἱκανὴν εἰς ταυτομάτως συμπαραχωρεῖν αὐτοῖς καὶ τὴν ἐλληνικὴν ἰθαγένειαν; Πὼς οὐχ ὑπὲρ τὸ δέον πολλὰ λίαν περὶ ἐαυτῶν δοκοῦσιν οἱ τῆσδε χάρις εἰς αὐτοὺς δυστυχοῦς χώρας πολιτικοί; Ἡ ἐξ-επέσαμεν τόσον ὡς ἔθνος ὥστε μὴ πλέον ἔχειν μεταξὺ ἡμῶν τιν' ἄξιον τῆς σημαίας ἡμῶν, ἀναγκάζεσθ' εἰσάγειν ξένους μισθοφόρους οὐ μόνον πρὸς τὸ συλλέγειν καρποὺς ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὸ φέρειν τὴν σημαίαν ἐν ἑορταῖς, καὶ παρελάσει καὶ πολέμοις τοῦ ἔθνους; Ἡ δικαίως αἰσθάνονται τόσον ἔναντι τῶν ὁμολόγων αὐτῶν ξένων μειονεκτοῦντες οἱ ἀνάξιοι ἡμῶν ἄρχοντες ὥστ' ἐκλαμβάνειν τὸ ὅλον ἔθνος ἀνάξιον ὡς αὐτοί, δι' ὃ καὶ σπεύδουσιν "ἐλληνοποιεῖν" πάντα τυχόντα ὑπισχνούμενον αὐτοῖς (ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ καὶ ἡμῖν πᾶσιν!) ἐξ ἀνακλάσεως δόξαν (καὶ χρῆμα); Ἡ ἄρα τόσοι πολλοὶ ἐγένοντο ἐν ἡμῖν Ἐφιάλται ἔτοιμοι κάφ' ὑψηλῶν παραδοῦναι ξένους τὰς Θερμοπύλας;

Μισόξενον ἐμφανίζουσι τὸν λαόν! Πὼς καὶ τοῦτ' οὐκ ἐστὶν ἔργον τῶν ἀρχόντων ἡμῶν; Πὼς ἀσφαλίζουσι τὴν χώραν κατ' εἰσβολέων λαθραίων; Ποιοὶ οἱ νόμοι οἱ καθορίζοντες τὸν ἀριθμὸν κατὰ τὰς ἡμετέρας ἀνάγκας,

προέλευσιν, υγείαν, ποιότητα, δεξιότητας, βούλησιν ἐνσωματώσεως οὐ μόνον εἰς τὸν οἰκονομικὸν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν ἐθνικὸν ἡμῶν βίον τε καὶ ἰσθὺν τῶν μεταναστῶν οὓς ὑποδεχόμεθα; Πῶς ἐνσωματοῦμεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ἔθνος; Ποῖον ἐπὶ γῆς ἕτερον ἔθνος ἀδιαφορεῖ ὡς οἱ ἐνταῦθα πολιτικοὶ καὶ "διανοοῦμενοι" περὶ ἀκριβῶς τούτων; Τίνος ἐπὶ γῆς ἔθνους ἑτέρου οἱ "διανοοῦμενοι" διατείνονται ὡς οἱ ἡμέτεροι ὅτι χρὴ τοὺς ὑποδεχομένους παρέχειν τοῖς μετανάσταις (νομίμοις τε καὶ παρανόμοις) ὡς καὶ παιδεῖαν κατὰ τὰ ἐν ταῖς πατρίσιν αὐτῶν, ἃς ὁμοῦ μετὰ τῆς ἐκεῖ παρεχομένης παιδείας οἰκιοθελῶς ἐγκατέλιπον; Εὐρήκασιν οὗτοι ποθ' ἑαυτοὺς εἰς θέσιν μετανάστου ἐξ ἀδερφίου ἀνάγκης ἐλλόγως ἐγκαταλιπόντος οὐ μόνην πατρίδα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν ταύτης "πολιτισμὸν" ἅπαντα, τὸν ἀγαγόντ' αὐτὸν εἰς ἐγκατάλειψιν τῆς πατρίδος αὐτοῦ; Οὐκ ἐστὶ ταῦτα ζητήματα τῆς πρωτίστης φροντίδος τῶν περὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ καὶ αἰσχροῦ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς τοῦ λαοῦ τυρβαζόντων πολιτικῶν, τῶν παρὰ ταῦτα δοκούντων ἑαυτοὺς ἱκανοὺς ἡγέτας λαῶν; Πῶς οὖν ἄρα τολμῶσι διὰ μισοξενίαν κατηγορεῖν τὸν λαόν τοῦτον, καθορῶντα πανταχόθεν παραβιαζομένην τήν τε χώραν καὶ τὴν ἐθνικὴν οἰκογενεῖαν, ἐξ αἰτίας τῆς παντάπασιν αἰσχροῦ ἀνικανότητος, ὀκνηρίας, ἀδιαφορίας καὶ βουλιμίας τῶν πολιτικῶν; Ὅποιον τὸ ψυχῆς ἔρεβος τῶν τοιαῦτα ποιοούντων καὶ διατεινομένων; Ἡ διὰ τῆς πρὸς Κρίσιν ἐτοιμασίας ἐνοποίησης τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων κοινωνιῶν, σκοποῦσα τὸ Πνεῦμα, ἐπιζητεῖ τὴν συνεχῆ αὔξησιν ὡς καὶ τοῦ μεγίστου κοινοῦ πνευματικοῦ "διαιρέτου" αὐτῶν τοῦ ἐνοῦντος αὐτάς! Ἡ ὑπὸ κενῶν Πνεύματος δῆθεν "διανοουμένων" ἐπιχειρουμένη ὁμογενοποίησης τοῦ παγκοσμίου χυλοῦ, σκοποῦσα τὸν μηδενισμὸν, ἀπεργάζεται τὴν συνεχῆ μείωσιν ὡς καὶ τοῦ ἐλαχίστου κοινοῦ πνευματικοῦ "διαιρέτου" τοῦ ταύτας συνεχόντος, τὸν πλήρη ἀφανισμόν πάσης ἀνθρωπίνης πνευματικότητος, μόνης ἀσφαλιζούσης πᾶσαν ἐνότητα! Ὁ γενικὸς τοῦ κακοῦ κατὰ τοῦ Καλοῦ πόλεμος μαίνεται, κυρίως διὰ τῆς κατασυκοφαντήσεως πάσης ἀξίας καὶ ἱεροῦ! Ἐντὸς ψυχῶν, οἰκογενειῶν, κοινωνιῶν καὶ ἐθνῶν! Μεταξὺ τάξεων, ἐθνῶν, ἡπείρων καὶ πολιτισμῶν! Παντοῦ ὅπου ὁ Λόγος ἀπουσιάζει! Ὑπὲρ τῶν κοινῶν πνευματικῶν ἱερῶν ὁ ἀγὼν, διὰ τοὺς σὺν Θεῷ! Ὑπὲρ ἐξουσίας καὶ χρήματος, διὰ τοὺς μὴ τι ἱερόν ἔχοντας! Μόν' οἱ ἀνίεροι ἀνίερα λέγουσι καὶ ποιοῦσιν! Ὡς οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν ὁμολογεῖ Θεὸν Ζῶντα, πῶς ἐστὶ ξένη ἢ δύναται μένειν ἀδιάφορος πρὸς πάντα τὰ δεινὰ ταῦτα ἢ ὅλη Θεολογία;

Καλῶς ἀντιλαμβάνεσθε πλέον πόσον πολὺ κινδυνεύομεν, οὐ μόνον ἐξ αἰτίας τῆς ἐπιστήμης καὶ τῆς θρησκείας, ἀλλ' ὡσαύτως ἐξ αἰτίας καὶ τῆς πολιτείας καὶ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἡμῶν, ἀκούειν δικαίως τὸ παρ' Ἡρακλείτου ῥηθὲν Ἐφεσίοις! Ὡς καὶ πόσον ὄψιμος πλέον ἐφέστηκεν ὁ καιρὸς τῆς ὑπὸ τῆς Ἀκαδημίας ὡς ζῶντος Πνευματικοῦ Σώματος ἀναλήψεως τῆς εὐθύνης τοῦ ὁδηγήσαι τὸν τόπον αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸ φῶς! Ἡ σιωπὴ πρὸ τοῦ συντελουμένου κακοῦ τῆς μετὰ κείνου συμπράξεως ἐστὶν ἰσοδύναμος! Μάλιστα κρεῖττον τὸ ὁμολογεῖν εἶναι προσκαίρως ἐν σκότει, ἢ τὸ ὅλως τυφλοῦσθαι διὰ τοῦ πεισμόνως καλεῖν "φῶς" τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῖν σκότος καὶ διὰ παντὸς οὕτω μένειν ἐν σκότει! Ὁ Λόγος οὐ συγχωρήσει ἡμᾶς ἀδρανούντας! Ἐρρῶσθε!

ΥΠΟΜΝΗΜΑ ΕΠΙ ΤΗΣ ΘΕΩΡΗΣΕΩΣ GÖDEL

Νῦν ἐπιτρέψατέ μοι παρουσιάσ' ἐν συντομίᾳ τὴν μέθοδον τῆς θεωρήσεως Gödel. Αὕτη συντελεῖται ἐφ' ἐνὸς set (universe of discourse) of objects (in arithmetic, of *numbers*) U , to which applies a formalized language L . To U by the L there corresponds a set of true statements S_U . The first question is whether there exists a codifiable axiom system A such that the set of statements derivable from it, S_A , corresponds to S_U . *Only in some cases* is this in fact possible, as for example, when U is a *finite* universe, or when the language L is so lacking in expression that it does not even permit the expression of complicated properties of U . [Συνεπῶς, ἐπὶ τῇ ὅψει τῆς ἀληθείας ὅτι τὸ set τῶν φυσικῶν ἀριθμῶν ἐστὶν *infinite* rather than *finite*, καὶ αὕτη ἡ ἐφαρμογὴ τῆς θεωρήσεως Gödel ἐπ' αὐτοῦ καθίστατ' ἀμφίβολος! Ἐτι δέ, *κἂν ὑποθέσωμεν* τὴν θεωρήσιν Gödel ἰσχύουσιν *ἐκ πρώτης ὄψεως* εἰς τὸ φυσικὸν σύμπαν, ἢ κατὰ τὰ ἔτι παραδεδεγμένα ὑπάρχουσ' ἀμφιβολία περὶ τῆς *χωρικῆς* (*finite or infinite?*) ἐκτάσεως τοῦ φυσικοῦ σύμπαντος (περὶ ἧς ὁ Einstein παρέμεινε μέχρι τέλους ἀμφίβολος, καὶ ἐφ' ἧς τὰ πράγματα παραμένουσιν οὐσιαστικῶς ἀμετάβλητα) ἀφ' ἐνός, καὶ ἡ *πτωχεία* ὡς γλώσσης τῆς θεωρίας τῆς σχετικότητος (ἐχούσης τὴν δομὴν αὐτῆς διαφορικὴν, οὐχὶ ὀλοκληρωματικὴν ὡς ἀπαιτεῖται διὰ τὴν *αὐστηρὰν συναγωγὴν οὐσιαστικῶν προβλέψεων δι' ἐαυτῆς μόνης*), καθίστησι *διττῶς* ἀμφίβολον τὴν ἐφαρμογὴν τῆς θεωρήσεως Gödel ἐπὶ τοῦ φυσικοῦ σύμπαντος!] Περαιτέρω, ἡ μέθοδος *ὑποτίθῃσιν* that a process called codification, or arithmetization, or Gödelization is possible to carry out, of the language L itself that applies over U , by which *natural numbers* are assigned to the elements of L . This is done so that, firstly, natural numbers are assigned to the fundamental symbols, so that sequences of symbols correspond to certain finite sequences of natural numbers. In the second stage, the finite sequences of natural numbers thus produced are put in one-to-one correspondence with the natural numbers. The natural number that corresponds in this way to an expression H is called the code or Gödel number of H and denoted by H^* [Clearly, even if this assignment be believed logically permissible (for why indeed should to a certain symbol in set theory or symbolic logic be assigned a *particular* natural number, say, 2, rather than another, say 5?), what justification is there to apply this sort of arithmetic codification to the elements of a more complicated language? In the set of natural numbers, the symbols 2, 3, 4... are *not* just symbols arbitrarily assigned, *but also represent the values of the various sums of units* (1) that are symbolized by 2, 3, 4... There is *no* such correspondence in the case of the symbols used in set theory or symbolic logic, or, for that matter, in literature!] Following this assignment, the object domain U is *assumed* to “conjoin” with the domain L and their semantic correlation to form a new “universe” called meta-object domain $\bar{U}$. As A stands to U , in the same way another meta-language $\bar{L}$ is *assumed* to be valid over $\bar{U}$. The method then “projects” into the

language L predicates of U that are expressible only in the meta-language $\bar{L}$. It is clear that if any language *is* abstract to a certain degree, a meta-language corresponding to the above *disparate* mix must be abstract to a much more enhanced degree! And clearly, as objects are objects, as operations are operations, as language is language, and as thoughts expressed in the language about the objects are just thoughts, the Gödel method can *only* apply if *all* assumptions *truly apply* and the *entire* mix of objects, symbols, operations, thoughts contain no internal contradiction and lead to no such! A very high order of demands indeed! So that it would be extremely risky to assume the Gödel reasoning applicable to fields and cases where the conditions are *not meticulously* met.

Which, however, is indeed very difficult if not ipso facto impossible to conceive as possible for this *qualitative* reason, quite apart from any conceivable technical ones: Whereas it is true that given the infinitude of prime numbers a number can be assigned to a member of a non-infinite set of other things, the arithmetic values of prime numbers are fixed and they all (i.e., the numbers) can be arranged in a unique order and have between any two of them a unique value ratio. But if, say, the notion of Justice be arbitrarily assigned a particular prime number, how indeed can something else, *also naturally not quantifiable by number* be assigned a higher or lower (and what?) number? How may one judge the values of *qualitatively different things* and assign to them prime numbers bearing between them a *fixed* value ratio? Arbitrariness and doubtless contradiction *is thus built in ab initio* in the Gödelization procedure, that *is useless* as a method of comparing anything other than numbers, even *if* it is at all useful to them all! Which, however, in no way may at all be conceived to affect the structure of Logic, or Logos, or of the Total Reality!

N. B. To make the meaning accessible to more people than experts, the present publication of the original letter was subjected to some re-editing.

AUTHOR'S COMMENT: This letter demanded perseverance during both writing and, doubtless, studying. To this day of preparing this entire volume for publication, Academician Artemiades did not see fit to grace the occasion (prompted by *his* own reference to the works of Gödel and Tarski in his opening address to the conference on "Science and Orthodoxy") with *any* response! Nor did I hear that the Academy *as a body* took *any* action at all in response to my request, in the direction even of suggesting correction of anything at all that is not well functioning in the Greek State and Nation! Some people, having partitioned their minds, do indeed prefer to appear that they can competently play on both the scientific and theological boards, and on other boards as well, all the while remaining stubbornly unwilling to displease any one side, even for the greater good of us all! Just do not ask of them to confess that *indeed all boards are by their intrinsic nature closely interconnected and ultimately but solely one!*

**Re: ΕΠΙ ΤΟΥ ΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΤΙΚΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΘΕΜΑΤΩΝ
ΕΘΝΙΚΟΥ ΕΝΔΙΑΦΕΡΟΝΤΟΣ**

Κύριον Στέφανον Μάνου,
ΒΟΥΛΗΝ ΤΩΝ ΕΛΛΗΝΩΝ
Ἀθήνας, 10021

Μαΐου 28, 2001

Ἀγαπητὲ Κύριε Μάνε:

Γράφω ὑμῖν ἐπ' εὐκαιρίᾳ τῆς ὑμετέρας συνεντεύξεως εἰς τὴν NET τὸ ἑσπέρας τῆς 21ης τρέχοντος. Λυποῦμαι βαθύτατα ὅτι δεῖ μ' ἀποστεῖλαι ὑμῖν τὸ παρόν, ὃ *λυπήσει ὑμᾶς, πάλιν παρασυρθέντα* ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐνδημοῦντος γενικοῦ κλίματος *ἀποσπασματικῆς, οὐχὶ συνολικῆς*, ἀντιμετωπίσεως τῶν θεμάτων καὶ *οὐκ ἀναχθέντα* εἰς ὃ ὕψος τὸ κύριον θέμα, οἱ καιροί, αἱ διαχρονικαὶ ἀνάγκαι τοῦ ἔθνους, τὰ διεθνή παραδείγματα καὶ αἱ διεθνεῖς σχέσεις τῆς χώρας ἀπαιτοῦσι παρὰ πάντων ἡμῶν: ὅπως μελετηθῶσιν αὐτὰ ὡς *ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ πρὸς ἄλλα διαπλέκονται*· καίτοι γινώσκετε κάλλιον ἴσως πάντων ἐν τῇ Βουλῇ ὅτι *οὐχ ὑπάρχουσι magic solutions ἢ silver bullets*.

Τὸ πρόβλημα τῆς ἐν τῷ ἐγγὺς μέλλοντι ἀδυναμίας πληρωμῆς τῶν ὀφειλῶν τοῦ ἀσφαλιστικοῦ τῆς χώρας συστήματος *οὐκ ὀφείλεται*, ὡς κοινῶς λέγεται, εἰς μόνην τὴν (διὰ *νόμου ἀδίκου*) μὴ καταβολὴν εἰς τοὺς λογαριασμοὺς τῶν ταμείων τοῦ *δικαίου* ἐπιτοκίου, καὶ τὴν μεταφορὰν τῶν πόρων τῶν ταμείων εἰς τοὺς θύλακας καὶ τάει πλατυνόμενα φυλακτήρια τῶν "ὀλίγων" (παρότι καὶ τοῦτο ὄντως ἐγένετο τελευταίως μέσῳ τοῦ χρηματιστηρίου, τῆς "σοσιαλιστικῆς" Κυβερνήσεως πιεσάσης)! Ὀφείλεται, ἀντιθέτως, εἰς τὰς κατὰ τὴν παρελθούσαν πεντηκονταετίαν *ὑπερβολικὰς* πραγματικὰς καὶ *εἰκονικὰς-λογιστικὰς* αὐξήσεις μισθῶν, ὑπαρξάσας *ἀδίκους* (πλὴν *οὐχὶ* διὰ τὸ εἶναι ταύτας εἰκονικὰς, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὰς *πέραν τοῦ ἀληθῶς εἰς ἕκαστον κατὰ τὴν ἐργασίαν αὐτοῦ ἀναλογούντος ποσοστοῦ αὐξήσεως τοῦ ἐθνικοῦ πλούτου*), φορολογηθείσας (πλὴν *οὐχὶ* ὅμως λογιστικῶς ἀλλ' ὡς *ζῶν εἰ καὶ πληθωρικὸν χρήμα*) κατὰ τὸ *ἀνώτερον εἰς ὃ ἐνέπεσαν* ποσοστὸν γενικοῦ φόρου καὶ ὑπὲρ ταμείων κρατήσεων, καὶ οὕτως ὡς *ζῶν χρήμα ἐπιστραφείσας* εἰς τὸ σοσιαλιστικὸν (πλὴν ὅλως *ἀνόητον* διὰ τοὺς αὐτοῦ ἄρχοντας) κράτος ὅπερ ἐχρήσατο αὐτῶν *ἀπρεπῶς καὶ ἀσώτως*· πρὸς μείωσιν μὲν τῆς ἀνεργίας, *ἀλλ' οὐχὶ διττῶς ἐν ταύτῳ καὶ πρὸς δημιουργίαν ἀληθοῦς κεφαλαίου ἐθνικοῦ πλούτου!* [Ἡ κυρία αἰτία τῆς κρατικῆς σπατάλης καὶ ἀσωτείας *ἦν καὶ ἐστὶν οἱ σκαλδαλῶδεις διορισμοὶ εἰς "θέσεις" ἀεργίας*, ὅθεν *μηδενικὸν ἢ ἐλάχιστον πλούτου παραγωγικὸν ἔργον* παρήχθη ἢ καὶ νῦν ἔτι

παράγεται, ἀντὶ διορισμῶν ἐργατῶν (γενικῶς ὀριζομένων) παραγόντων ἀκριβῶς αὐτὸν τὸν νῦν ἀπαιτούμενον ἀλλ' ἐλλείποντα πλοῦτον! Ἐλάχιστον δ' ἄλλο παράδειγμα τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων αὐτὰ ταῦτα τὰ ἔργ' ἀναπλάσεως τῆς Πλ. Ὅμοιός: οἱ ἐπιχρωματισμοὶ τῶν κτιρίων ἐπερατώθησαν πρὸ τῆς ἐκκινήσεως ὡς καὶ τῶν χωματουργικῶν ἔργων τῆς ἀναπλάσεως καὶ τῆς ἐπὶ τῶν κτιρίων ἐπικαθίσεως τῆς ἐκ τῶν ἀτελευτήτων "ἔργων" θλιβεροτάτης ἀθηναϊκῆς κόνεως καὶ αἰθάλης!: Προφανῶς ἴν' ἀμφότερά: καὶ οὐδέποτ' ἔχωμεν καθαρὰς οὐδὲ τὰς κυρίας πλατείας καὶ πλείονα σπαταλῶμεν! Τοῦθ' ὅπερ οἱ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἄρχοντες οὐ ποιοῦσιν ἐν οἴκῳ ποιοῦσιν ἀνευρυθριάστως καὶ ἡλιθίως ἐν δῆμῳ! Καὶ περὶ ταῦτα ἀλλήλους κατηγοροῦσι—πλὴν ὅμως οὐχὶ διὰ τὸ ἡλίθιον ἢ τὴν σπατάλην, ἀλλὰ τὴν τιμὴν τῆς πατρότητος! Κρατικῆς δὲ σπατάλης οὐδέποτ' ἐλεγχομένης διὰ λεπτομεροῦς καταγραφῆς πάντων (καὶ τῶν κεκρυμμένων) αἰτίων τοῦ κόστους καὶ συγκρίσεως μετὰ τῶν ἐν ἄλλαις χώραις δαπανωμένων δι' ὅμοια καὶ καλλίονα ἔργα! Π.χ., πῶς ἐξηγεῖται ὅτι οἱ αὐτοκινητόδρομοι τῆς παρούσης ποιότητος ἐντροπῆς ἀπαιτοῦσι ποσὰ μείζονα κατὰ τρέχον χιλιόμετρον τῶν ἐν αὐταῖς ταῖς ΗΠΑ τελειοτάτων καὶ ἀσφαλεστάτων τοῦ κόσμου;]

Παράγωγα τῆς ὅλως ἀσώτου ταύτης διαγωγῆς ἦσαν ἢ (διὰ τὸν προσεταιρισμὸν ψήφων) διὰ δανεικῶν μέχρι καὶ τοῦδε πολυτελῆς ἐθνικῆ διαβίωσης, ὁ μέγας πληθωρισμός, ἡ χαμηλοτάτη σχέσις ποιότητος πρὸς δαπάνην, ἡ ἀπουσία εὐσυνειδησίας (δι' ἣν οὐδεὶς τῶν δημοσίων ἀνδρῶν κατασχύνεται) καὶ ἡ νῦν ἀπειλουμένη ἀδυναμία πληρωμῆς τῶν λογιστικῶς ὑπολογισθειῶν ὡς ὀφειλομένων συντάξεων διὰ μηδέποτε δημιουργηθέντος ἀντιστοιχοῦντος αὐταῖς ζῶντος χρήματος μεταβιβαζομένου ἀπὸ γενεᾶς εἰς γενεάν διὰ τοῦ (παρ' ἡμῖν μὴ δημιουργηθέντος καὶ ἄρα νῦν ἀνυπάρχοντος) κεφαλαίου ἐθνικοῦ πλούτου (ἐν ᾧ δεῖ ἡμᾶς συγκαταλέξει καὶ τὸν μὴ γεννηθέντα καὶ ἐκτρωθέντα καὶ παντοιοτρόπως φονευθέντα καὶ φονευόμενον ἐθνικὸν πλοῦτον ἀνθρώπων, συγκεκαλυμμένως ὀνομαζόμενον "δημογραφικὸν πρόβλημα", περιφρονηθέντα χάριν ἀνέσεων καὶ ἀσέμνων διασκεδάσεων)!

Οὐδεὶς (= οὐδὲ εἷς) ποτὲ τῶν πολιτικῶν ἐξηγήσατο, ὥστε διηλεκτῶς τοῖς πᾶσι σαφὲς ἦ, ὅτι τὰναδιανεμητικὸν σύστημα κοινωνικῆς ἀσφαλίσεως γήρατος ἀπαιτεῖ (εἰδάλλως καταρρέει) καὶ τὴν δημιουργίαν ἀληθοῦς πλούτου ἐτοίμου πρὸς διανομὴν ὡς δημογραφικῶς πλὴν δικαίως (οὐδέποτε χαριστικῶς) ἀπαιτεῖται καὶ πέραν αὐτῆς τὴν δημιουργίαν τέκνων (παρ' αὐτῶν γε τῶν ἀσφαλιζομένων), εἰς ἃ ἀντὶ τῆς αὐτῶν πρὸς τοὺς γέροντας ἀρωγῆς μεταβιβάζεται τὸ δημιουργηθὲν κεφάλαιον ἐθνικοῦ πλούτου! Ἀντὶ τούτων, μύδρους καὶ ἐκ καθεδρῶν μόνους ἀκούομεν, κατὰ τῆς δημιουργίας καὶ πλούτου καὶ τέκνων, καὶ ἐν ᾧ σήμερον τοῦ προβλήματος! Μέχρι τοῦ 2050 ὑπάρχει χρόνος δημιουργίας δύο πλήρων πολυαριθμωτάτων γενεῶν! Πλὴν περὶ τῆς λύσεως ταύτης οὐδεὶς ὁμιλεῖ, οὐδ' αὐτοὶ οἱ ἀπαιτοῦντες καταλαβεῖν ἀκοπιάστως καὶ ἀναξίως θέσεις τῷ ἔθνει δαπανηρὰς νῦν μὲν εἰς σπουδαστικά ἔδρανα, εἴτα δ' εἰς ἔδρανα διδασκάλων καὶ καθηγητῶν εἰς αἰθούσας κενὰς μαθητῶν! Ταῦτα δ' ἐνῶ, ἡλιθιώτερον καὶ θρασύτατα, ἀπαιτοῦσιν ἐπίσης τὴν ἀπαγκίστρωσιν τῆς παρεχομένης αὐτοῖς ἢ δι' αὐτῶν πεινχροτάτης "παιδείας" ἀπὸ τῶν ἀναγκῶν τῆς οἰκονομίας, ἀφ' ἧς ἐν ταύτῳ ἀπαιτοῦ-

σι παχυλὰς παροχὰς καὶ διορισμοὺς εἰς θέσεις ποικίλας ὅθεν *μηδενικὸς* πλοῦτος παράγεται, ἀλλὰ μόναι *ἀκαθαρσαί*!

Ἄπο καὶ μόνης τῆς ὡς ἄνω ἀναλύσεως καταφαίνεται διατί ἡ ἐν ἀρχῇ δηλωθεῖσα λύπη μου ἐστὶ βαθυτάτη. Ὑμεῖς, *ἀνευ κατ' ἐλάχιστον τῆς ἀνωτέρω εἰ μὴ καὶ καλλίονος ἀναλύσεως*, προτείνετε τὸ κεφαλαιοποιητικὸν σύστημα *στηριζόμενον* εἰς ὁμολογὰ τοῦ ἑλληνικοῦ δημοσίου (παραμένοντος κατὰ τὰ λοιπὰ ὡς γε νῦν ἔχει!), οὐδ' ἐπὶ στιγμὴν *ἀναλογιζόμενος* ὅτι καὶ τοῦτο οὐ παύει εἶναι *καθαρῶς λογιστικὸν* ὡς καὶ τὸ μέχρι τοῦδ' ἀναδιανεμητικόν! Οὐδεμία γὰρ πιθανότης ὑπάρχει (τοῦ λοιποῦ *συστήματος διοικήσεως καὶ γενικῆς ἐν Ἑλλάδι νοοτροπίας παραμένοντος*) ὅτι ἡ ἀπλὴ δι' ὁμολόγων ἀναγνώρισις μελλοντικῆς ὑποχρεώσεως πληρωμῆς λύσει τὸ πρόβλημα! Τὸ πρόβλημα, ὡς νῦν ἔχει, οὐκ ὀφείλεται εἰς τὴν ἀπουσίαν τίτλων-ὁμολόγων (ἅτινα καὶ νῦν δύναται διανέμεσθαι διὰ τὰς μέχρι τοῦδε γεγενημένας ἀσφαλιστικὰς εἰσφοράς, πλὴν ἵνα μόνον κοσμήσωσι τοίχους!) ἀλλὰ χρημάτων, δηλαδὴ πλούτου, μὴ παραχθέντος ὑπὸ τὴν ἐποπτείαν τῶν ἀρχόντων τῆς παρούσης νοοτροπίας! Ὡς καὶ ὑμεῖς περιορίζεσθε, φεῦ, εἰς μόνον τὸ προτείνειν τὴν διὰ κρατικῶν ὁμολόγων (διὰ τὴν δῆθεν ἀσφάλειαν κατ' ἀπάτης τοῦ προτεινομένου συστήματος!) ἀπλὴν ἀναγνώρισιν ὀφειλῆς, παραβλέπων ὅτι πρῶτον τὸ κράτος ἐφ' ὅλην πεντηκονταετίαν ἀπατηλῶς ἔδρασε! Πᾶσα (κἂν ὑπογεγραμμένη) τοῦ κράτους ὑπόσχεσις οὐ καλλίων δύναται εἶναι τῆς ἀξίας τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἡ μέχρι τοῦδ' ἀξία τοῦ λόγου τοῦ κράτους γνωστὴ ἐστὶ πᾶσι τοῖς συναλλασσομένοις, ἐντοπίοις καὶ ξένοις! Ὅτε τὸ δανειζόμενον κράτος πληθωρίζει τὸ νόμισμα ἵνα μειώσῃ τὴν ἀληθινὴν ἀξίαν τῆς ὀφειλῆς, παρακαλῶ ἐξηγήσατε πῶς τοῦτο τηρεῖ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ! Λέγετε (σαφῶς διὰ τῶν συμφραζομένων) ὅτι ἂν τὸ κράτος γενικῶς καταρρεύσῃ τότε οὐδεὶς ἀσφαλιζόμενος δικαιωθήσεται ἀπαιτῶν τι παρὰ τοῦ μὴ ἔχοντος! Παραβλέπετε ὅτι ἡ κοινωνικὴ ἀσφάλις οἴουδ' ἕποτε τύπου συνώνυμός ἐστὶ τοῦ συνολικοῦ τῆς χώρας συστήματος δομικῶς μὴ καταρρέοντος, ὅτι πᾶσα ἐκστομιζομένη παραδοχὴ καὶ πιθανὴς ἔστω δομικῆς τοῦ κράτους πτωχεύσεως-καταρρεύσεως ἐστὶ λογικῶς ἀνεπίτρεπτος εἰς πᾶσαν συζήτησιν κοινωνικῆς ἀσφαλίσεως! Ἀλλὰ τίς ἐστὶν οὗτος ὁ λόγος ὁ λέγων, διὰ στόματός γ' ὑπουργοῦ· "δάνεισέ με τώρα διότι ἔτσι ἐγὼ θέλω, κι ἂν πεθάνω τᾶχασες!"; Ἡ νῦν διαφαινομένη ἀδυναμία ὁμολογία ἐστὶ (πᾶσι πλὴν τυφλοῖς καταφανῆς) καταρρεύσεως-πτωχεύσεως τοῦ ἀσώτου τῆς τελευταίας πεντηκονταετίας συνολικοῦ τῆς χώρας συστήματος! Ἡτις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖται, κρυπτομένη ὀπισθεν τῆς μετακυλίσεως ἐπὶ τὸ μέλλον τοῦ χρέους! Ἡντινα φεῦ νῦν ὡς καὶ ὑμεῖς καταφαίνεσθ' ἐπιχειρῶν συγκαλύπτειν, ὡς ἐπὶ τοίχου μέγα τι ρήγμα, δι' ἐπικολλωμένων ὁμολόγων ἀπὸ τοῦδε ἐγγράφων! Λυποῦμαι ὅτι αὐτὴν ἔδοτε τὴν εἰκόνα!

Οὐχὶ γὰρ αἴφνης, ἡ παρὰ πάντων τῶν θεωρητικῶν περιφρόνησις τῶν ἀριθμῶν ἐν Ἑλλάδι ἐγένετο ἐφιάλτης! Ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦτο τίς ἄλλος πταίει εἰ μὴ οἱ περὶ τοὺς σκληροὺς ἀριθμοὺς ὅλως ἄσχετοι, κἂν ὑπουργοί, κἂν καθ' ἕλην καθηγηταί; Κατὰ τούτους καὶ ὁ τούτους ἀκολουθῶν, καὶ ὁ τούτους ἐμπιστευόμενος! Ἀπορῶ πῶς ὑμεῖς ἐπιλέγετε ἴστασθαι μετὰ κείνων! Πλὴν εἰ κακῶς ἀντελήφθην!

Παρακαλῶ πρόσχετε: Ἐπεκαλέσασθε τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ κράτους ἐκδίδομεν' ὁμόλογα διαρκείας 10 ἐτῶν καὶ ἐπιτοκίου 7% κατ' ἔτος. Ἀλλὰ ταῦτα οὐκ ἐστὶ προσβάσιμα ὑπὸ κοινῶν ἰδιωτῶν, πλὴν κατόπιν καταβολῆς σημαντικῶν τελῶν εἰσόδου-ἐξόδου (νῦν συνολικῶς 5%) εἰς "ἀμοιβ(αίου; κινδύνου—ἀκούονται γέλωτες)αῖα" κεφάλαια (ὡς διεπίστωσα προσελθὼν εἰς τὸ παρακείμενον ὑποκατάστημα τῆς Ἐθνικῆς Τραπεζῆς)! Πόσ' ἀληθῶς (τῶν τελῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τοῦ "ἀμοιβαίου" κινδύνου καὶ τοῦ πληθωρισμοῦ συνυπολογιζομένην) γίνονται τὰ μετὰ 40 ἔτη δῆθεν 264 ἑκατομμύρια; Οὐδεὶς νῦν γινώσκει! Ἀλλ' ἡ παρούσα παραγωγὴ πλούτου σὺν τῷ παρόντι ἐπισήμῳ πληθωρισμῷ ὑπολείπονται τοῦ 7% ἐτησίως! Ἐὰν δ' ὁ πληθωρισμὸς ἀξηθῇ ἵνα ἡ διαφορὰ καλυφθῇ, ποῖον ἔσεται τάληθες (τουτέστι καθαρὸν πληθωρισμοῦ) τίμημα τοῦ λογιστικοῦ συνόλου τῶν 264 ἑκατομμυρίων μετὰ 40 ἔτη; Πᾶν κεφαλαιοποιητικὸν σύστημα ἀποβλέπον εἰς τὸ ὑποστηρίξειν ζώσας ἀνάγκας ἐξαπατᾷ ἂν οὐδεμίαν νύξιν ποιῆται τοῦ ὑπονοουμένου πληθωρισμοῦ! Ἐτήσιος πληθωρισμὸς 7% σημαίνει τὴν ἐτησίαν μείωσιν τῶν 100 μονάδων εἰς $100(100/107) = 93.458$, καὶ μετὰ 40 ἔτη εἰς 6.678 μονάδας, καὶ ἄρα τὴν μείωσιν τῶν μελλοντικῶν 264 ἑκατομμ. εἰς μόνον 17.63 ἑκατομμ. σημερινῆς ἀξίας, δι' ἃ καταβληθήσεται κεφάλαιον $100,000 \times 12 \times 40 = 48$ ἑκατομμ. μονάδων συνεχῶς μειουμένης ἀξίας! Ἐτήσιος πληθωρισμὸς 4% ἀντιστοιχεῖ εἰς ἐτησίαν μείωσιν τῶν 100 μονάδων εἰς $100(100/104) = 96.154$, καὶ μετὰ 40 ἔτη εἰς 20.828 μονάδας, καὶ ἄρα τὴν μείωσιν τῶν μελλοντικῶν 264 ἑκατομμ. εἰς μόνον 54.99 ἑκατομμ. σημερινῆς ἀξίας! Ταῦτα δ' ἄνευ συνυπολογισμοῦ τοῦ προαναφερθέντος κόστους 5% καὶ τοῦ "ἀμοιβαίου" κινδύνου! Λυποῦμαι διότι οἱ σύμβουλοι ὑμῶν ἐξώθησαν ὑμᾶς εἰς ἐντυπωσιασμὸν-δημαγωγίαν (ὑμῶν ἦσσαν' ἀλλ' ὁμοίαν τῆς μέχρι τοῦδε γνωστῆς) τοῦ ἀκροατηρίου!

Ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῦτα δεῖ μ' ἐρωτᾶν: Ἀντιλαμβάνεσθε καλῶς τί νῦν ὄντως συμβαίνει ἐν εὐρωπαϊκῷ πλαισίῳ ὅπου ὁ πληθωρισμὸς ἀφίεται κατατρῶγειν τὴν ἀξίαν τοῦ εὐρώ, δι' οὗ κατακλέπτονται οἱ θύλακες τῶν μὴ κλεπτῶν· ὅπου οἱ Εὐρωπαῖοι (ἐν οἷς ἡμεῖς γ' οἱ Ἕλληνες πρῶτοι), διότι ἀδυνατοῦμεν ἐπιλῦσαι τὸ πρόβλημα τῆς ἀνεργίας ὑπὸ μηδενικὸν πληθωρισμὸν τοῦ νομίσματος, κατελίπομεν (ἡμεῖς γ' οἱ Ἕλληνες ἐμμέσως μέσῳ τῶν λοιπῶν Εὐρωπαίων) πάσας τὰς ἐλπίδας ἡμῶν εἰς τὴν ἀμερικανικὴν ἀγοράν, ἐν ᾗ μόνῃ ἐλπίζομεν εὐρεῖν πελάτας (οὓς συνεχῶς ἡμεῖς οἱ Ἕλληνες καθυβρίζομεν) διὰ τὰ ἐκεῖ ἐξαγώγιμα εὐρωπαϊκὰ προϊόντα; Διότι πῶς ἄλλως ἐξηγεῖται ἡ συνεχῶς ἔναντι τοῦ δολλαρίου μειουμένη ἀξία τοῦ εὐρώ, τουτέστι τοῦ ἰδρώτος τοῦ Εὐρωπαίου ἐργαζομένου, αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν κυβερνήσεων του ἀρνούμενων ἰδεῖν τὰ ἐνδοευρωπαϊκὰ πράγματα τὰ προκαλοῦντ' ἀμφοτέρα καὶ τὴν ἐνεργίαν καὶ τὸν πληθωρισμὸν; Ἀντιλαμβάνεσθε καλῶς τί συμβαίνει ὅτε ἡ τύχη τοῦ εὐρώ ἐγκαταλείπεται εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἀθηναϊκαῖς, π.χ., λαϊκαῖς καὶ λοιπαῖς ἀγοραῖς λιανοπωλητῶν, τῶν ὀπισθεν αὐτῶν καλῶς κρυπτομένων, τῶν συνδικαλιστῶν, τῶν δημοσίων κηφήνων καὶ τῶν μεγαλοσχιδίων ἀπατεῶνων, πάντων χλευαζόντων οὐ μόνον τὸ κοινὸν νόμισμα, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο τὸ μέλλον τῆς ἡπείρου; Οἱ κομμουνισταὶ καὶ λαϊκισταὶ τῆς ἀριστερᾶς κατέστρεψαν τὴν Σοβιετικὴν Ἑνωσιν, τὴν πλουσιωτάτην χώραν

τῆς γῆς! Ἐπιτρέψομεν νῦν τῇ *πονηρῶς χάριν ὀλίγων ψήφων ἡνωμένη μηδ-
ειστικῇ (nihilistic)* ἄριστεροδεξιᾷ καταστρέψαι ἐν τῇ γενέσει αὐτῆς τὴν
ἡνωμένην Εὐρώπην; Διατί περὶ τούτων οὐδεὶς τῶν πολιτικῶν, οἰκονομολό-
γων καὶ κατὰ κόσμον δῆθεν σοφῶν ὁμιλεῖ, οὔτ' ἐν Ἑλλάδι οὔτ' ἐν Εὐρώπῃ;

Ἀντιλαμβάνεσθε ὅτι ἡ μείωσις τῶν ἐπιτοκίων καταθέσεων πρῶτον
μειοῖ τὴν ἀγοραστικὴν δύναμιν τοῦ *γρηάσκοντος* *εὐρωπαϊκοῦ* *πληθυσμοῦ*
βασιζομένου πλέον εἰς οἰκονομίας *ζωῆς* καὶ ὕστερον προκαλεῖ *αὐξημένην*
ἀνεργίαν, τοῦ πληθυσμοῦ αὐτοῦ *ἐξ ἀνάγκης* *ὀλιγώτερα* *ἀγοράζοντος*; Τί, ἐ-
ρωτῶ, ἐστὶ κάλλιον διὰ τὴν ὅλην οἰκονομίαν: τὸ *τηρεῖν* *σταθερὰν* τὴν δύνα-
μιν τῶν ἀγοραστῶν καὶ ἀποκομίζειν κέρδη ἐκ πωλήσεων ὑπὸ *μηδενικὸν* *πλη-*
θωρισμὸν διὰ τῆς συγκρατήσεως τῶν τιμῶν παραγωγῶν-προμηθευτοῦ, ἢ τὸ
μειοῦν τὴν δύναμιν τῶν ἀγοραστῶν καὶ δημιουργεῖν τὰ *προσκαίρως* μέγι-
στα δυνατὰ κέρδη προμηθευτοῦ δι' αὐξήσεως τῶν τιμῶν, *παρότι οὕτω προ-*
καλεῖται *πληθωρισμὸς* καὶ *περαιτέρω* *μειοῦται* ἡ *δύναμις* *τῶν ἀγοραστῶν*,
ὅθεν οὐκ ἐστὶ δυνατόν ἐξελεῖν πλὴν διὰ τοῦ *θανάτου* τῆς ἀγορᾶς *φονευού-*
σης τοὺς καταναλωτὰς ἐφ' ὧν αὐτὴ ζεῖ; Πότ' ἐπὶ τέλους οἱ εὐρωπαῖοι κυ-
βερνήται ἀναγνωρίσουσιν ὅτι οὐχ ὑπάρχει ἐπιτόπιος ἀγορὰ ἄνευ ἐπιτοπίων
ἀγοραστῶν, καὶ ὅτι ἡ ἐπιτόπιος ἀγορὰ αἰεὶ μέλλει φθίνειν τῶν ἐπιτοκίων
καταθέσεων πεσόντων κάτω *ἤδη ὑπερβαθέντων* ὀρίων; Ἐγένετό ποτέ τις
μελέτη παρὰ τινος τῶν δῆθεν διασήμων καθηγητῶν ἐν Ἑλλάδι ἢ Εὐρώπῃ
τοῦ *ἀρίστου* *ἐπιτοκίου* *καταθέσεων* τοῦ *ἀσφαλίζοντος* *διαβίωσιν*, *κέρδη* *καὶ*
ἐργασίαν *ὑπὸ μηδενικὸν* *πληθωρισμὸν*; Ἡ ἐπὶ *φαῦλα* *μόνα* *καταδαπανῶνται*
οἱ καθηγηταὶ καίτοι παρ' ἡμῶν πάντων λαμβάνοντες τοὺς μισθοὺς;

Ἀγαπητὲ Κύριε Μάνε:

Ἐλπίζω ὅτι οὐ φονεύσετέ με ἄγγελον διὰ τὸ μήνυμα! Τὸ λέγον ὅτι τῶν
πραγμάτων ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ ἐχόντων ὡς ἔχουσιν, οὐδέποτε, ὑπὸ τὰς λοιπὰς καὶ
ἀρίστας συνθήκας, γενήσεσθαι τι πλέον ὑπουργοῦ *συνεργαζομένου κατὰ*
συμβιβασμὸν συνειδήσεως! Ἀξίζει τοιοῦτον *πιθανὸν* *μέλλον* τῆς ὑμετέρας
σιωπῆς περὶ τῶν *σθαρῶν* *θεμελίων* τοῦ *γενικοῦ* ἐν Ἑλλάδι συστήματος ἠθι-
κῆς; Ἐρωτῶ διότι ἐφιλοδοξήσατε γενέσθαι καὶ ὑπουργὸς τῆς Δικαιοσύνης!
Καλλίονος *μέλλοντος* ἐγὼ δοκῶ ὑμᾶς ἄξιον! Ὅμως ἐπιμελῶς *ἀποφεύγετε* *λέ-*
γειν *τι*, *ἐξ ἀνάγκης* *ὀδυνηρόν*, περὶ τῆς ἐν Ἑλλάδι γενικῶς ἀσκουμένης *ἀν-*
ηθικοῦ *"φιλοσοφίας"*, περιοριζόμενος εἰς τὰ δῆθεν καθαρὰ τεχνοκρατικά!
Ἄλλ' ἡ πολιτικὴ καὶ πᾶσα ἑτέρα κοινωνικὴ συναλλαγὴ, καὶ τεχνοκρατικῶς
ἐνεργῆται, εἴτε οἰκοδομεῖ ἐπὶ *στερεοῦ ἠθικοῦ* ὑποβάθρου, εἴτε "κτίζει" ἐπ'
ἄμμου! Ὡς τάνωτέρω πιστοποιεῖ! Ἡ ὅλως *ἀνήθικος* ἡμῶν "ἠθικὴ" ὡς λαοῦ
περιήγαγεν ἡμᾶς εἰς τὸ παρὸν ἀδιέξοδον! Οὐ γὰρ τυχαίως γίνονται πλού-
σιοι ἢ πτωχοὶ οἱ λαοί! We, now a nation without much culture on account
of our leaders-teachers-professors, fancy the wealth of the rich, but we
hate beyond measure their work ethic that alone brought about their
wealth! Unless we adopt their work ethic too, *we are destined to fail in our*
pursuit of its product! Ὁ διὰ τῆς *ψευδοῦς* *"ἀνωτατοποιήσεως"* τῶν ΤΕΙ ἁ-
κρατος λαϊκισμὸς καὶ ἡ διὰ διευρύνσεως τῆς δῆθεν ἀνωτάτης ἐν Ἑλλάδι
"παιδείας" *παρεμπόδισις* τῶν νέων σπουδάζειν εἰς *ὄντως ἀνώτατα* *ξένα*

πανεπιστήμια καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἔνδον ἐν ταῖς ἐκεῖ κοινωνίαις καταγιγνώσκειν **the protestant work ethic** οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ, ὡς πᾶς ὁ πείραν καὶ νοῦν ἔχων κατανοεῖ! Πολὺ πλέον "πανεπιστημιακῶν διπλωμάτων" ἀξίας *κενῶν*, ὁ τόπος **needs to be cross-fertilized with, and imbued by, the complete spirit of work ethic, that is not taught locally and will never be taught locally before it is brought over!**

Τοῦτο φεῦ ἐστὶ πεδῖον *καταλειφθὲν ἀνενεργὸν* καὶ παρθένον παρὰ πάντων τῶν ἐν Ἑλλάδι νῦν ἐχόντων φωνὴν *δῆθεν* ἡγετῶν, *δῆθεν* πολιτικῶν, *δῆθεν* φιλοσόφων, *δῆθεν* διανοητῶν, ἐξ ἐπαγγέλματος *δῆθεν* ἀνθρώπων τοῦ πνεύματος!

Ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ τούτῳ, εἰ ἐν αὐτῷ δράσετε οὐδεμίαν οὐδενὸς σχήσετε συμβιβασμοῦ χρεῖαν, καὶ σεβαστότερος γενήσεται ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν μεταξὺ τῶν ὀλίγων τῶν δυναμένων κατ' ἀξίαν κρίνειν τὰ πράγματα! Ἐφ' ᾧ καλεῖσθε **become a true statesman, instead of remaining a very ordinary Greek politician forgotten in fifty years!**

Εἰ δὲ τῶν πολλῶν ἡγαπήσατε τὴν ἀγάπην... Ὅπερ μὴ γένοιτο!

Προσηκόντως,

Υ.Γ. Τεχνοκρατικόν: Ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ χώρᾳ, ἔχομεν ἡλιακὴν ἐνέργειαν *ἄφθονον*· *ἄφθονον* θάλασσαν (ψυγεῖον καὶ πηγὴν ὕδατος)· *ἄφθονους* καταλλήλους ἀποκρήμους κολπίσκους· *ἄφθονους, καλῶς ἀμοιβομένους* (εἰ δ' οὐ, διατί οὐ παραιτοῦνται;), καθηγητὰς καὶ κέντρα ἐρεῦνης καὶ πανεπιστήμια (ὡς καὶ Αἰγαίου)· *ἄφθονους* πολυπληθεῖς συν(ῆ ἀν)αρμοδίας(;) δημοσίας ὑπηρεσίας καὶ ὑπουργεῖα! Ὡσαύτως, γνωστὰ ἐστὶ τὸ παράδειγμα τῆς ἐν Συρακούσαις παρ' Ἀρχιμήδους *ἡλιακῆς καύσεως* τοῦ ῥωμαϊκοῦ στόλου· ἀπὸ τινων αἰώνων οἱ ἡλιοστάται· ἀπὸ πεντηκονταετίας ἢ διὰ *συγκεντρώσεως* τῆς *ἡλιακῆς ἐνεργείας* *τῆξις* ὡς καὶ *χάλυβος*· ἢ θερμοδυναμική! Ὅμως, ἢ τοῦ θαλασσίου ὕδατος ἀφαλάτωσης ἐν αὐτῇ γε τῇ θαλάσσῃ, καὶ ἢ κείμεν τοῦ καθαροῦ ὕδατος ἀντλησις διὰ τῆς ὡσαύτως *ἄφθονου αἰολικῆς ἐνεργείας* *never crossed the modern greek mind!* Διὰ τὴν *ὑπεράφθονον* παρ' ἡμῖν "εὐφυΐαν", *λειψύδρους* (καὶ ποσίμου, καὶ ποτιστικοῦ, ἔτι δὲ καὶ *πλύσεως* τῶν *παράλιων τουαλετῶν* διὰ θαλασσίῳ ὕδατος) τὰς νήσους καὶ τὴν μείζονα χώραν ποιοῦμεν! Πλὴν οὐδόλως καταισχυνόμεθα! Ὅτι ἐγκατέλιπεν ἡμᾶς ὡς καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ αἰσθησις τῆς αἰσχύνης!!!

ΑΠΟΚΡΙΣΙΣ: Οὐδεμία.

Re: LETTER TO DR. GEORGE BISTIS

Professor George N. Bistis
64 Kline Boulevard
Berkeley Heights, NJ. 07922

October 10, 2001.

The Clash and Reconciliation of Civilizations in the Globalized World

(A re-worked version of the original sent)

Dear George:

In vain had I been waiting to see you here since I got your early July note! Then in early September, before we left for our yearly curative baths, on calling Costas to learn about you, I heard that your trip would almost be a flight-by-night-*con*-friends affair, that would not leave you with any free time! Well, I hope to see you on your next trip, the timing of which will be more precise!

Your now even more pertinent question regarding the truth in those two NY Times articles by Thomas L. Friedman “*Zorba the Euro*” and “*They hate us—They need us*” must after Sept. 11 be answered in a much wider context, involving not only Americans and Europeans and Greeks, but also Arabs, Jews, Asians and so many others that fall into special categories of thought, feeling and action—in essence *all* inhabitants of this globe: So, sit as comfortably as we all everywhere may now sit, and consider as seriously as we all everywhere *must* now do the naked facts! *Not* that I already know them all, or have worked them all out in full detail! I, too, will learn as I go along! May I commit no injustice! *Reason* is the Teacher of us all, facts and events are only *His* tools! This is going to be a long letter on, rather a *study* of our world! Suitable only for *Braves*!

The Broad Stage of Human Events

The debate *is wrong* if it insists on deciding which of the two, Fr. Fukuyama or Sam. Huntington, is right and must be refocused on finding out *how far they both are right*! Our powers of foresight are always limited. Unless we ride on universal laws *proven* to apply to *all* times, our power of *forespection* isn’t

there! If at all, we see, and clearly *only if we are truly willing* to see, only in *re-trospection*. That's why *nobody* foresaw the recent events. Only *after* Sept. 11 do we see that that date marked the end of history, though only as we knew it up until then. With the clash of civilizations officially begun on that date, we now have entered the age proper of globalization, that we had *not* foreseen in its true dimensions. You know my *clear* position that *nothing that exists just happened, that everything has a reason, both as cause and objective!* From this general position, not even the socio-historical facts are exempted! So, in just a few words, the socio-historical, or otherwise, the *civilizational over the long course of history* facts are those that led us here, that shortsighted we first called globalization of the "market"; that only now do we find is *not* restricted to just the trade of goods, but uniting *all* of history, *in order that it make full sense of it all*, and having started from a *seemingly innocuous* "athletic" beginning, includes *all* aspects of life, from joy to sorrow, from happiness to unhappiness, from health to decease, from satiation to hunger, from peace to war, from safety to danger, from arrows to nuclear and chemical and biological weapons, from Communion to narcotics, from Paradise to Hell, *everywhere* on this very limited globe! Globalization in just one-only aspect of life *is* fake! It is up to us to decide whether we prefer to live with fraudulent ideas and figments even if professorially advanced, or whether we, finally grown up, prefer to face the now naked challenge! You know my argument for the *incontrovertible Logical Need that everything has had a beginning—everything except God, as He alone belongs in a distinct category of being having just one member, separate from all other "things"!* An argument that inescapably includes the lemma that *everything having a beginning also has an end, unless proven everlasting as a matter of Logical Necessity!* To put it otherwise, in terms never before used, *very few* people, I find, realize that *complete* globalization is not just inescapable in ordinary yet fuzzy mundane terms, but *also an inescapable part of that same Logical Necessity* that *also* includes the *long ago theologically introduced* End of History, that is known as Second Coming and Judgment! Very few people realize that we *cannot* all be judged on an equal footing *unless we all belong in a common world of common problems!* Until we come to this realization, we *cannot* escape the charge of seeing the world like isolated illiterate peasants believing *their village* to be the entire world, or at least the center of it!

"America vs. the World" is only the Current Title of an Old Game

Despite their tenor, those two articles depicted the *true* state of feeling much less than half-jokingly, I am sorry to say! A conclusion that was only accentuated after the Sept. 11 events! The reasons, some simple, the rest most embarrassing, *all* deadly when carried to their extreme, are legion! The problem, now clearly seen to be universal, put in its broadest historical perspective, is none

other than the age-old socio-historical race to “be first” and eventually *rule* the world! The *natural* outcome of this race is to declare *just one* victor! And *so many losers, unable to rejoice in the victory of the best, resenting him secretly or openly for his victory*—at which point I shudder thinking that *there may after all be a secret connection*, only now surfacing, between the two meanings of the word race! But do we realize that the victor is *not* quite the best, *unless he realizes that this resentment is there and needs addressing*, yet in ways that will ameliorate it, *even as the logical need of having a victor remains? And that part of his victory is the responsibility not just of caring, but of leading in caring, for all spiritual and mundane needs of the entire world*, because he *objectively cannot alone bear all the burden, that must be borne by them all not only “according to their (mundane) needs”, as the indolent Carl Marx and his followers insist for it costs them nothing, but also according to their contribution to the production of (also spiritual and not only mundane) wealth!*? I am not sure that we all do! I am *not* blaming America for not doing her part! The victory *has just been! Nobody had prepared her, or the world*, for this *true other face* of the age-old race to “be first”! It takes some time to realize that the quest *was a coin*—having *two* faces! Have we had this discussion before Sept. 11, we would have restricted ourselves to an *ordinary* discussion of the problems touched by Friedman! How ready-to-burst the boil was *nobody* had told us! The good journalists are *not* as sharp observers of the world as they have us believe! They rather take pleasant trips, *as usual at our expense*, cracking jokes and getting half-drunk or worse in luxurious hotels! From there, the boils of the world are *not* seen, *nor* are the “rich and famous” *local* people they meet any better informed of the local boils! They are too busy enjoying themselves as *provincial* members of the world jet set!

Beginning and End of the Race to conquer the World

Let me explain the attitude of the Greeks and others before, as the times now call, returning to the Sept. 11 events and their causes. Having learned from the Persians, who lost it, the game of “be first”, first the Athenians, then the Spartans, then the Thebans and then all the Greeks (minus the Spartans) tried their hand at imperialism. They were far more successfully followed mainly by the Romans, then the Byzantines, the Arabs and all the rest in more recent times, who refined the “game” to make it “world domination”! More than all the rest, for their Olympic tradition, the Greeks *ought never to forget* that this *deadly* so-called “game” is decided *at the end not at the beginning*, by *who finishes and stays first, not who starts out first*, and is an *agon* (=ἀγών) of *constant* struggling and *agony*, *not* of resting on one’s parents’ wreaths; a *constant* reaching out for the *future*, *not* of looking toward the (*not* so glorious) past, that in retrospect inevitably shows itself in all its blemishes! So, more than all the rest, the

Greeks, but with them all the rest too, *ought never to forget* that this *deadly* “game” *always has* a victor because it is *designed to have* a victor—as an incentive for participation! Not only when individual athletes are competing, but also and far more importantly when entire nations are engaged in it! It behooves *all honest players, be they men or nations*, to understand that in the end, they *must wholeheartedly declare and acknowledge the victor*, or else they show themselves *dishonorable, having entered the competition dishonestly*! Alas, the majority of the Greeks, I am ashamed for them to observe, seem *truly to begrudge* the (final) victory of America, and they never stop, opportunity given, to exhibit their bitterness! And *little to not at all* do they realize, even after Sept. 11, *how unGreek, how oriental*, this is! This is also true of other Europeans, too, who wiser or more cunning grind their teeth in sullen silence; while the Greeks, being more extrovert *and* foolish, show it off regardless of consequence! However, the Sept. 11 events demonstrated that the Greek and European feelings of displeasure do not just pale but vanish compared to those in Western-Asia and the Middle-East! After all, Greeks and Europeans are not exactly peasants in the world village; that dubious honor belongs to the truest peasants of all, that, divided into two camps, inhabit those oriental parts, and since before the Persian attack against Greece never stopped fighting *among themselves* over the world, each side believing itself its rightful inheritor, both sides based on that *one* Old “Holy Writ”! That at present the one camp *uses* America as its tool is incidental, that the other attacks America as *that* tool just standing in the way is consequential. “Nothing personal against America, it all is just their way of doing *their regular* business”! To this I will return later. Now on the reasons of why “they hate us”.

The Sorry Tale of Grudges against America

To begin with, besides the forgotten cardinal rule of honest gentlemanly competition I mentioned above, there is the grudge of the man (or nation!) that having started out first sees himself (itself) overtaken by another coming up from behind! Then, there is the self-delusion of considering one’s own earlier contribution fundamental to all later development, for which the world owes him/it an *eternal* debt, regardless of whether or not it truly is, or of whether it leads to error added to earlier error!: *Uncultured* Greeks of this generation believe that *eternal* tribute in respect and cash payment is due *them* for the contribution of their forebears! *Uncultured* Europeans believe that *they must be respected and obediently heard*, mainly by the “uncultured” Americans, *for the “values” they first do not value* of Enlightenment and the French Revolution, as well as for their “greater experience” in world matters! That the French Revolution took place in light of the Enlightenment thirteen years *after the American* Revolution, and that the Americans had the *first ever written Constitution of an*

entire Free Nation two years *before* the French Revolution and *without* the horrors that followed it, and that the “enlightened” and “experienced” Europeans caused *two* world wars with some four to five scores of millions of dead, from which both they were literally saved by the Americans, arming, defending and feeding them, all these and more the “good” *pink* Europeans all too conveniently forget! To them all, the Americans are “upstarts”! Tell-tell-tell the lie, and some more of it shall eventually stick! Then, there is the yellow-green grudge of prodigal sons having spent the inheritance, usually undeserved, of one-time “nobles”! To this day, Europeans do *not* spent enough to defend their own civilization! They *always call on and beg* the Americans, whom they then accuse of “interference”, “imperialism” and western-style sheriff “brutality”, as in the Balkans! The “civilizational” difference of America from Europe “seen” by Europeans ignorant of America produces *real* contempt: The sometimes spectacular arrests of *violent criminals* on American highways are here presented as “police brutality”! The executions of *proven* criminals, even such as McVeigh, are seen as “uncivilized”! *Fearing for their own fate*, “progressive” anti-American Europeans believe that society *must* keep its enemies well fed in luxurious prisons—with leaves of absence, no less, if they should incline to return! For his character, for which “the criminal is not responsible”, he *cannot but act* criminally! Society, bound by its own high principles, *may not* take his life! Now, the Taliban argue that, bound by their religion, they *cannot but take* the lives of the infidel! But *they* bound by their own religion of love *may not* exact just punishment, slandered as “retribution”! You can guess where the haters of America stand! These days, calling *incompetent* the FBI and the CIA, the Left in effect *foolishly*(?, *no deliberately*) *accuse* the Americans of *not having established a (Stalinist) state able to prevent* the destruction at the WTC—forgetting that they *would* then argue that the American is a suppressive system! Already they shed crocodile tears for the current checks of personal freedoms that Americans, understanding, welcome and *only criminals* object to! *They always side with the criminals and the terrorists*, against *both* the local police which *they* have emaciated and the Americans for acting, *for lack of other, even at their behest*, as policemen of the world! *Now* they say, the Americans “ought” to have acted in Afghanistan *immediately* following the attack at the WTC and the Pentagon, forgetting that they *then* had *attacked* President Bush for “sounding childishly, arrogantly, brutally polemical, threatening a poor nation without proof of their wrongdoing”! *Now* they say that America is not exacting punishment but *retribution*, that by delaying her action, she has forfeited her right to demand satisfaction, to bring the criminals to justice, to exact punishment for the most heinous crime in human history, to teach a lesson to all would-be criminals, as if police action delayed in order that the murderer be arrested most effectively is proscribed by the statute of limitations! *Now*, they say the American action is no other than a

naked effort to establish the American Imperium in Middle Asia and ensure the profits of the oil companies, “forgetting” that the oil companies besides caring for the profits paid to their stockholders passing them on to the entire economy and thus to *all* workers, also strive to supply oil everywhere in the world at the most reasonable, considering all variables, prices from which even the poor states and individuals profit! The Left here, including those in the governing party, have long been *soft against both, and argued apart*, “ordinary” crime and political terrorist activity, *and have done very little against the former and nothing against the latter*! Even in ancient times, the latter had been argued an honorable duty of the democratic citizen against the tyrant! That tyranny born of democracy is due to the corruption of the latter and vanishes when corruption is removed *is* overlooked! Even the present prime minister and several of his ministers are proud for their *claimed* setting of bombs during the “time of the colonels”, for which there is, of course, no independent confirmation! I personally suspect that the present *unconfessed* attitude is that “political terrorism is a necessary tool of democracy, removing enemies who know too much and threaten critical revelations”! As when a banker having *proof* of political grand theft “*threatens*” to bring down a party “democratically” elected to govern! Just imagine how many hundreds of thousands *would* lose their jobs (or “jobs”) dispensed by the party through the government! In *unconfessed fear*, the friendly and unfriendly press, do *not* clamor for the extinction of terrorism! Thus mithridated, public opinion is silent, even *friendly* toward political terrorism, brought to believe that those “removed” are dangerous to public order, the working class, even the nation; while the government *consciously delays interminably taking substantial action against its own tool* despite international, mainly Anglo-American, pressure! Now that terror has struck America, and the President has *correctly* warned even those that harbor the terrorists, it doesn’t take brains to guess where such people stand! The Greek civil defense *is* nonexistent; the European, if it exists at all, is a veritable joke! No one in Europe speaks of civil defense! On the other hand, fearing themselves, the Europeans do not want strong *national* armies, and being all nationalistic, they do *not* want a *unified* European army! They save the expense too, while *basking under the American umbrella*, which they regard a *natural* phenomenon due them as a birthright, not as a *privilege won through effort, work, heavy sweat and contribution*! The American “interference” is *always* damned, whether “suspiciously and calculatedly” it is late to arrive, as in Somalia and Bosnia, or it does not arrive at all, when it is “arrogantly indifferent” to what is needed! Alas, part and parcel of the present conflict of civilizations *is the decadence and muddled thinking within*! The complaints of bleeding hearts from Seattle to Genoa have been instigated by the teachings everywhere of such “highly respected” indolent atheist Marxist professors as, say, Noam Chomsky, who *always* attack the “haves” in the presence of *lesser* “haves”

having enough to buy their trash and in the process make *them* rich, and *never* assess *just* blame to the “have nots” (whom they have *never* met in close quarters) for their often *willful* backwardness. The attacks of Americans are always brutal! The “playful” training by their Afghan fathers of *infants* in *real arms double in size to their own height* does *not* prick the Leftist bleeding hearts! The Afghan peasants “deserve” our sympathy, but we bomb them! That they farm opium poppies *by choice, for the greater income it brings them through the sale of heroin to us* is forgotten! Who said the Leftists aren’t generous to a fault? The truly needy *do not* have the means to travel cross-continent whether to Seattle, or Göteborg, or Genoa! The arsonists of the Left are *never* short of the money needed! The *system* gives it to them! As the working Left has *never* offered to have its pay cut in order to finance the continued employment of those that get unemployed, in order that *all working people work together to soften* the business cycle, so too, it complains from Seattle to Genoa *against the yet poorer of other lands*, whom they want denied the right to sell their cheap goods to markets *they* regard their own turf, and *it is* the first to complain when the Government raises taxes to finance unemployment benefits! They always point the finger at Bill-Gates-and-such for his/their wealth, *unable* to admit that Gates’ stocks can only be turned into real money in a *slow, orderly manner, provided other rich people exist and buy* what he liquidates! No! World recession *must get bad*, even as it hurts everyone, in order that *all people get to know* what America-bashing really means—which will be good, if finally the haters see!

Consider now the grudge for the loss of an undeserved inheritance as it applies to the later Greeks: They inherited the Eastern Roman Empire, to the establishment of which they contributed very little, and to the endurance and obligations of which (as guardian of civilization) they contributed even less other than its own built-in enduring power, lasting as long as it lasted under the *indifferent if not inimical* eye of the Eastern Church turned “blissfully” *Asiatic in attitude toward civilization*! The overall *sorry* history of Byzantium as contributor to world civilization (just compare its contribution to that of the *previous period of equal duration*!), is *only partially* masked by the fact that Byzantium saved the *small* part we now possess of the ancient inheritance (the rest of which it left to wither and crumple, or even be *destroyed*), and the fact that *only relative to it* was the rest of Europe less civilized, until it came ahead. The grudge of Greeks against America *subconsciously includes this mainly ecclesiastical grudge* against Western Europe (which for the Schism in the Church, the Greeks say, did nothing to *save* Byzantium; that *had done nothing to protect and advance the Roman-European Empire and its civilization*, which the Greeks do *not* see), because America *is the inheritor and continuator of Europe*, and to the degree she is Catholic and Protestant partakes *by inheritance* of the blame of abandoning Byzantium, and now still does “nothing” to advance Greek interests, *as if she had* some such

obligation! Added to this is the grudge of the Left against America for being the present-day victor-apparent of the race to “be first”. *This* is how the *unholy alliance* of the Left and “Orthodoxy” has been shaped! In their eyes, America is *always* guilty of “imperialism”, as also of hedonism and decadence, for they know *nothing* of America (other than they see in eighth-rate Hollywood films *they freely buy* for being cheap) and her *ennobling spiritual agony of creation* by mind and hand, over the book and paper, on the drawing board, in the mine below, the laboratory, the factory, the plant above, up in the skyscraper that defies gravity and points to heaven as the fate of humans, *always beyond the frontier of the unknown*! Such almost solely American considerations do *not* shake their small, closed, acrophobic, painfully provincial minds!: So, America is guilty if she withdraws to herself, for she then criminally ignores the needs of the rest of the world and chooses to enjoy her “imperial” wealth! And guilty if she tries to carry along the world to where even the poor can sell their produce and product and *all advance by common effort*, for she then criminally exploits the rest and establishes her “imperium”! In satanic frenzy bound to last only one short night, her haters will love America only if she first empties her wealth into their lap and then jumps into the deep sea! What hell of a madhouse they will find themselves in in morning, only then will they find out, being so clever!

They *forget* the *true* imperialism of Asiatic Byzantium, smelling heavily not only of oriental condiments but also of oriental political, philosophical and theological spices! They *believe* that empire *theirs*, they don’t have to know all its details and measure all its quality, they *forgive all its innumerable vices*! The modern view of Byzantium is influenced heavily by the “Church”, that in fact *ruled* behind both illiterate *and* literate emperors. It is important that apart from other intellectual activity that remained non-existent as we understand it in later times, *not even* philosophy was advanced in Byzantium, other than the “theological” one we know, that however *fell far short* of what the Holy Spirit *still expects of us*, or else *He would have called* the human experiment *enough, terminated*! To put it otherwise, *refusing to advance, only* “preserving” a *frozen*, that the Church still regards a forever long since fixed Revelation, *always reacting belatedly and lazily*, simply *whiling the time away in lukewarm existence*, Byzantium *tired of waiting and passed away having exhausted everything it ever had*! It is because modern Greeks *still stand by one foot on Asiatic fatalism through Byzantium* that they set themselves apart from the modern world, and are more dragged into than willing to restart racing! With the people of traditional “literature” and *empty* word, rather than the scientists and engineers of *hard fact*, still determining the level of modern Greek civilization, with the Church *still daydreaming* of her *past* Byzantine glory she seeks to resurrect *not* for the major glory of God but only for the *oriental obedience* of the “Orthodox” to the pontiff in Constantinople, for which reason *alone* she still prefers to keep

him a *slave* of the Turk to whom *indirectly they thus still pay obeisance*, the modern Greeks do *not* regard the Western world *wholly* theirs, despite the fact that it is both the vessel of *all the very best* the entire world ever created (*including all worthy contributions of the truly enlightened East*), and the *only* present-day legitimate progeny of the Greek Spirit, that now holds in its embrace *all those everywhere who for their own true love of it regard themselves its inheritors!*

Misguided by unworthy self-serving teachers, they still regard themselves the *ostensibly legal* “fence and frontier”, as in times long since past, between what *they* define as East and West, in *both* of which they believe they belong, yet in proportions to their *momentary* liking, and *always ill-conceived* interest! These days, we see the mullahs raise hands in curse and threat, *neglecting to remove both their western gold wrist watches* shining brilliantly in the background of Afghan and Pakistani poverty and squalor *and their western gold-rimmed glasses* through which they can see at all! The *complete equivalent* of the Archbishop of Athens who *never* fails to attack the West ostensibly on “theological” grounds at every convenient opportunity, yet *chooses to ride an impressive Chrysler* limousine, and doubtless *always* reaches for a *western* aspirin when he has a headache rather than a Byzantine medical concoction! This, in case you did not have a correct *twin* picture of it, is modern Orientalism! Forget the Chinese and the Japanese: by comparison, those *are already* westernized! The others, those last barbarians along the strip from the Mediterranean to Pakistan to Indonesia, stubbornly refuse to read the time on their *western* wrist watches, worn as pure ornaments, not as reminders *to present* duty!

To these modern Greek grudges, add the most unforgiving one of those set to exploit the (*ended*) communist East vs. capitalist West conflict from within schools, academies, universities and even the Church, who made pals with “theologians” and Greek-style “liberals” and “libertarians” of all sorts! They assuage their loss by going to bed and waking up dreaming of the *early* collapse of the last, the “American Empire, that *must* also fold simply because all other ones before it did”! To them idiots to the last, the looming background of nuclear weapons means nothing: they *neither* understand that from here on changing empires *shall* involve their use, *nor* can they show us a *more* benign empire—only the following chaos, that *only they do not see* resulting! The obsession of revenge blinds them and they *cannot* see that they play the *now farcical* Greek folly of upper-class-Oxford-graduates-turned-traitors-yet-remaining-in-the-West *for its comforts under the secure protection of America*, without which *they now would have nothing, and their mothers-sisters-daughters-wives would walk the streets of Europe as pitiful whores just as those from East Europe!* Alas, the American umbrella has been much too benign and “natural”, and the American presence much too discreet for people even to imagine reality without it! Most of

them were not even born to *know* first-hand what Nazism and the communist uprising in Greece really were! Honest thinking simply does not come of dishonest spirit!

They also forget that, *for the West*, they are no longer among the poor of the world and now *they too* have a duty toward the truly poor! They *cannot* understand that the state of grievous poverty exists where, for the local social conditions, *the culture of reasoning work ethic is absent*, nor do they understand that the comforts of decent living take time to come *after much concerted applied thought and hard labor*. Nor do they understand that those in true need everywhere, agonizingly scraping a living, *simply do not have the time or strength to take to the streets*, but only people, as themselves, well fed! [Just last night, I heard a *silly* yet most clamorous Greek woman MP claiming that taking to the streets is indicative “of very high (political) civilizations”, thus implying that the communist party *and* the Pakistani mob (for *we shall not denigrate other civilizations*, especially the “high” ones according to this definition!) *are* two such examples, and the mobs from Seattle to Genoa are yet better ones!] Untrained and uncultured themselves, they have not yet put any limits to their dreams! Seeing themselves having less than they dream, they still believe themselves poor, and *don’t* see that even Pakistan and similar countries are *not* so poor if their citizens take so easily to the streets, and thus *may not* command our sympathy, *their relative, no longer abject, poverty being solely due to the long absence of concerted applied thought and hard labor!* Which, of course, also applies to Afghanistan, *where mutual killing under the goading even of “theologians” goes ahead even of feeding stomach and kid!* And one is *not* cynical when he wonders *whether it is humanitarian to feed people determined to kill each other at any rate!* Unless we regard it humanitarian to feed fratricidal people so that they may kill each other well fed! To the Greeks and others of this hue such considerations are “details”! They only offer *poisoned* criticism of the West, *never* a fully worked out practical thought, that they themselves *are ready* to put to the *local practical test!* For them, the “*bold*” *present need* is that America not just feed (and this *while they slander* the American manna as corrupting sly propaganda and sort of “soft” bombing!) but *quickly share* her wealth with *all* seekers of it!: They *don’t stop* at the thought that theft and robbery are *not* unknown even among the poor or those having equal shares, as more than equal is *still* sought! For the Left, such actions are OK; that America be rich *for her efforts* is not! Finding the *paper* property of Bill Gates greater than the sum of so many national GDPs, they call *him* “filthy” rich for it, *not them obscene* for *their filthy* condition! Nor, of course, do they say *exactly how* you turn stock shares to mouthfuls and cleanliness without selling them to *other* “filthy” rich willing to buy them at undiscounted prices! That the economic boom of the world depended on the *American* buyer who now has reached his limit to them counts for no-

thing! His *eternal obligation* is to *keep on* buying, *stop* being “filthy” rich, and *demolish* his “Empire”! All three! In perfect sense! *The* measure of anti-Americanism!

Least of all do they (as most of us) understand that the knot has finally reached the comb, that we now have joined a clash not just of *contemporaneous* civilizations but of civilizations separated by *at least* fourteen centuries! Proven by the *fact* that Theology, a *part* of civilization, *has remained stagnant for at least that long*, while the rest of civilization has marched on! Which ought to elicit in *all of us* the *fundamental* question of whether it was God’s will that Theology remain stagnant (in theological language, that the Holy Spirit stay *unhelpful*, which *is* a blasphemy), and the devil’s doing that the rest of civilization march on tempting us away from God! But our “Theologians” are much too thick for such thoughts! We do *not* understand, least of all the *so-called* “Orthodox” in Greece, that we now have *only just begun* paying the price of the *complete historical Byzantine failure* to Christianize the East! The “Christians” sold Christianity (already from within the New Testament!) on the *false* premise and promise of Paradise as *the* place of eternal rest and comfort, *despite* Christ’s own statement that “as His Father is always at work, so is He”—*and so ought we to be, too!* Which paradisiacal state the “Prophet” advanced by introducing there pilaf and houris! An *earthly* starved man’s *double* dream of bread and the warm, soft, living woman’s touch! *No* “Theologian”, in the West or the East, worth his *minimal* salt *ever* complained that this simply turns Heaven to Brothel, which *fully justifies* the term “Prophet”! How then are we now surprised that the mullahs turn the fellahs into fodder for hunger, starvation, cannon, demonic hatred of the infidel? Can any one suggest a *faster* transfer to *such* all-promising “Paradise”? And how can it escape us that no mullah will ever concede the point, fearing the loss of his grip on the fellahs driven by the *huge* potential difference between what they now have and what is there for them to conquer, both here on earth and there in “Paradise”? Look at them here! And look at the “promise” of mountains of pilaf and constant f— of their seventy two irresistible wives there! How that is Paradise for *women also*, *no* “Theologian” or feminist in the East or the West has *ever* explained! [Nor have we ever been told where the seventy two women to each man will come from; unless, simply given the numbers, *very few and not all men of Islam*, are to be saved even for *all* the women in the world; which, we must admit, gives Moslem women some greater hope for entering a *relative* Paradise, given their lot here—the *only* possible “argument” for their faith in the “system”!]: As there are 6 billion of us all told, 3 billion women all told, 2 billion Moslems all told, and 1 billion male Moslems all told, roughly, there at best are only three women to each Moslem male. So, in order that the “Prophet” be right, only *one in twenty four* of them can at best be saved! The Arabs are said to have discovered algebra. As their “Paradise” *is*

even arithmetically delimited, they are now found they never understood even simple arithmetic! Which, when understood, *may turn against us*, as there will then be a fierce oriental-style stampede for entry, the sole criterion being the most effective killing of us!] Which makes my stomach turn into a hard ball when I see “Theologians” argue ever soft-facedly, not to mention their brandishing closed fists! It is *their* doing that today people *are surprised at the benign face* of Mr. Bin Laden! *Our* theologians, too, sport *similar masks*, having understood *nothing* of the true meaning of Devil-Diabolos-Deceiver, or of why Christ’s Face is *always* stern! Having our theologians called, still *every* Sunday calling, God “unknowable” in *so many* ways, they *cannot* see that *the entire quality of “Theology” is in fact judged by the quality of Paradise included!* For her being the more spiritual, I regard this specifically a failure of the Eastern Church! So, it is *multiply sad* to see our *impertinent priests* attack the West, *even in these days of Judgment of their own failure over the long centuries*, instead of hiding in utter shame for their indolence! Alas, it *cannot* be helped: *Each of us in the East and the West adopts and honors the Theology that best fits his/her own spirituality*, by which he/she too is honored! *No* question about that!

You now have a more or less complete picture of Greek (and non-Greek, for some of which more below) gall and its origins. As also of how excruciatingly difficult and dispiriting is trying to open closed minds to modern air! When you spend the day in a deep mine, the *fresh dry* air you breathe on coming out smells “funny”! *They* pass out on breathing the *fresh* air!

As for the present-day Arabs and Moslems, they divide into two parts: *their* silent majority and *their* vociferous minority. As usual, *only* the latter takes to the streets and fills the world screens. How much of the former rejects or supports the statements of the streets is certainly hard to say. *Only the best part* of them attempt to revive and to continue the glorious tradition of letters and thought of their ancestors, minding the *creative* thankless and silent daily business that *slowly yet truly* transforms even their part of the world. The vociferous part never really stopped focusing on the still older days of *conquest* as far as Tours, and dreaming of lands beyond! None of this is surprising: the powerless ignorant poor (yet *not* so poor as *not* to take to the streets!) just dream and clamor; the educated and creative build the future; the vast part of half-educated determine the developments, leaning on this or that side! Therein lies the danger! *No one tells us*, we do *not* know and *cannot* know firsthand, and *they* do *not* say what *their* voice of conscience tells them, how much of it leans on the side of Reason and how much on the side of sentiment! Alas, in our times Reason has no universally acceptable advocates. If even in our parts where Reason was born and traditionally cultivated it is not rare that *sentiment* masquerades for Reason, *only less* of the latter may we expect of them among whom Reason never took deep root! On the contrary, sentiment, being far more popular and, *so*, bread-

bringing to those set to please the populace, never stopped having an oversupply of advocates! The mullahs are an abundant part of the oversupply! The poor are the last to examine the *true* reasons of their condition, *their own* contribution and culpability. Their street leaders, mullahs and politicians, *all actors following the wind*, are not fools; they are not there to assist, but to take advantage of! The “culprits” always are the filthy rich far off! In reaction to all this, yet coming to *their* assistance, the *Western* anarchical Left everywhere, wrapped in the cocoon of the Marxist explanation of history through which they only “see” Western conspiracies, *choose* to play the part of the fifth column, *still misreading* S. Huntington’s *Clash of Civilizations* as a *designed program* now set to work, *not* as a prophesy *already* exploded before our eyes by people that, unable to bear seeing themselves left behind in the race forward, try, even at the cost of their own lives, to bring the advancing front to a halt! Dressed in “religion”, the psychological wound of their egotism can only be “cured” if *all* humanity stops advancing, stops studying, stops trying out new ideas and things, stops even producing food and medicines that *delay* the Passage to “Paradise”, that need for their production not only knowledge but also vast sums of wealth that *cannot* be had unless the entire economy keeps apace! This is what they demand! If we do not accede, the fault is “ours”, for “arrogantly” ignoring the *mostly psychological and much less material* needs of “needy” humanity!

As for the present-day Jews, they no longer are a distinct nationality, and only loosely do they relate to the Hebrews of old. Rather, they comprise a people joined by a common canon of very old tenets having to do far more about the ritual habits of *this* daily life, than about a *concrete* belief in a *particular nature* of God and the stance, *relating to that nature*, of man before Him. This is why a religiously devout Jew and an atheist Jew, sharing *very little* Jewish blood, *are both equally Jewish* and none more or less so than the other: Their common ritual habits *suffice* to unite them, even as the atheist Jew rejects the validity of the Contract-Covenant-Testament agreed to between man and (*his* conception of) God! Religiously, they are united *only* by their *common rejection* of Christ! Because, Christ *rejected all adherence to ritual habit and all benefits arising from its strict observance*, and spoke of *another* Life, totally foreign to their *still active* expectation, restricted to *this life on this earthy-earthly* Earth! This is why we know of no Christian Jews in Israel, or Jewish Christians elsewhere! The Jews that became Christian became a *genuine* part of the Christian world *totally indistinguishable* from it. That the Jews *disperse* far better in a Christian society than do the Moslems is due to the *Moslem* demand that religion *integrate and command publicly all* daily life, a practice abandoned by Christian societies that are thus more permissive of *any* life-style, including the Jewish, that keeps ritual habits private and, local conditions permitting, always panders to the ruling fashion for profit while keeping itself jealously separate. That Jews and Mos-

lems in discussions with Christians in the West speak approvingly of Christ has to do *solely with His social, not His religious message!* No sane person *anywhere* on the globe can oppose Christ's social message! But Christianity speaks of this earthy-earthly Earth as a *God-designed training ground of our Spirit*, preparing itself for the *following purely spiritual Reality!* *That is the defining civilizational difference of the Christians, that is silently being attacked not only by Jews and Arabs* despite external appearances, but also by *all kinds of atheists*, homegrown in the West, that choose to be with whatever side stands against whom they see to be their greater enemy!

With these remarks firmly in mind, it is not difficult to see why people in the West stand with America or against her, or why the Moslems are generally against the West and America, or why the Jews *cling* to America, though only *half-integrated* in the West! On Arabs and Jews more below.

American Responsibilities in the Age of Globalization

After Sept. 11, the stance of the rest of the world towards his country is no longer a matter that can leave bemusedly indifferent a tolerant American, proud of his practicality. It will be a sorrowful spectacle to see America of all lands be the last to enter the new age, simply for her *romantic* clinging to the rosy times just passed when it was so American to be a teenager enjoying himself racing down the rural highway! *Civilizationally indifferent* to the rules of hospitality, the mostly intolerant world, guided by the very worst kind of still active Asiatic religious hatred, and acting not just intolerantly but with great deliberation, violated *barbarically* both his tolerant home and its people! For the sole reason that barbarity, even if it dresses in the camouflage of religious garments, will not be satisfied until it becomes universal! The invading barbarian has *no* qualms using the tools of civilization or the religious tolerance and other guarantees of the US Constitution for his obscene purpose of destroying his host. For their natural reticence, the Americans mistakenly avoided making plain to the entire world the multiple benefits, even if indirect, made possible to men everywhere by the religious tolerance of the US Constitution. Unless the Sept. 11 events prove a short-lived aberration, *America and the world as of that date entered a new phase in human history* in which, the *violation* of that demand of the US Constitution *cannot but bring forth its normally unwelcome effects*. The American Administration *has been grievously mistaken* to have concentrated its attention on *other* forms of danger ignoring the religious danger of extreme Islam! And the moderate leaders of Islam have grievously failed to take every possible preventive and educational measure against, and to make plain to the West, the religious danger building up from right under their own seats! It is that *double* failure that permitted the appearance of religious terrorists! It is useless trying to avoid the notion that international terrorism is always political and not religious! Because Islam

invades all aspects of life, all terrorism in Islam has from the start been *religious* in origin! So now, even if she succeed to crush terrorism militarily, America may no longer pretend she can return to her former internal religious innocence! Islamic terrorism, Mr. Bin Laden made it clear, is of a *totally other* nature, requiring that we address it at its *religious* roots! Indeed, can now people enter the USA simply by promising or even swearing allegiance to the Constitution? What's to be done *now* to avoid the possibility that years later they prove themselves sleeping perjurers reawaken to a (*foreign*) voice ordering them to cause havoc? And can we gamble that even natural born citizens will not be brought to religious frenzy by foreign prophets? The change brought in and violently forced on America thus is no longer a strictly domestic affair, but concerns the *entire* world. And people everywhere, unless intentionally barbaric and evil, *cannot* rub hands in glee for this *entirely undeserved* trauma of America, that is a *blow against civilization*! Whether America closes her borders to foreign religious intolerants and deals with them as they deserve outside, or whether she expels (how? where?) people of her own suspected as such in order to prevent similar future disasters without turning the Union into a veritable police state suppressing (certain) religious beliefs, or whether the Union secures its internal safety by suppressing (certain) religious beliefs, the Constitution shall have been violated! As no American loves to see the respective constitutional provisions violated, and as *the problem is civilizational and religious and thus cannot be resolved by any political means in existence*, America *must* exit the dilemma by overcoming her own reticence and addressing squarely the *religious roots* of the problem, yet in a manner *absolutely compelling above all reproach*, or else she will allow the rest of the world to heap even more (and less undeserved) abuse upon her!

Following the events of Sept. 11, the action taken against the wrongdoers, and the counteractions *taken and threatened*, there is no doubt that the world is *in great need of enlightened all-round leadership and rule*. Not only political, military or police, but even in *thinking* on matters we all so far have avoided or regarded nonexistent or improper to raise. If even villages need thought and ruling, it is *ludicrous, or else evil*, to insist that the global village with its infinitely more complex problems can escape the rule. The question is how to establish a *universal law of Justice*, in order that on coming to this sort of global power you yourself do not become the ultimate evil! The losers in the race to "be first" complain that the only "just" way to rule the world is that they too be "listened" to, that they, too, *co-rule*, for so "democracy" demands! Well then, *why did they too* enter the race and *did not ask from the start* on democratic grounds *that we all arrive together*? Which other race can they point to in which *all* contestants agree to arrive together? This appeal to "democracy" *after the race is run and lost* is the cry of the loser! Most of the complaint against America so far

has to do more with the *fact* that the losers have lost their “say”, and *less* with the *arguable* “fact” that America has been unjust. *Not* that she has never been unjust, but that she has, *rather rarely*, done it solely for her benefit! The use of rogue persons or states to punish some other such regarded with good reason worse, and the constant support of Israel are near enough the only complaints against America, but they are *not* entirely defenseless! It is more correct to say that America simply *does not yet know how* to establish universal Justice. And so far, it had *not* been universally clear that the establishment of universal Justice was solely her own responsibility! Those who charge her of neglect on this matter simply assess her a role that, in reticence, she had *not* regarded hers by right or automatic duty, for *she had not been alone on top!* And being reticent, and unwilling to draw fire for “arrogance”, America has not yet shown *she comprehends in all its gravity the need* of universal Justice, which *is* the sacred duty of the winner in the race to establish! The General Assembly of the UN has shown itself to be *not* a body of world government but a forum of begging, haggling, interminable debate, and occasionally of *placid academic* “resolutions”. Governance needs not only Justice, but also urgent, timely, decisive action. Governance is *not* the right of a “democratically” shouting crowd, but the sacred duty of the best (=aristos, hence aristocratic) as Plato has argued! Otherwise, the unschooled “democratic” masses are ready to havoc even Paradise! Democracy is best when it is *direct*, acted in small demes. The more numerable the commons, the greater the democratic “noise”, and the less effective the government. By winning the race, America *showed she has* the *best* experience of developing, possessing and directing the most complex mechanism of governance in human history, that alone gave her the victory! America *has therefore won the government!* *Not*, to be sure, by so-called “democratic” voting, that for the noise and clamor of the losers *cannot* declare a winner, but *by winning the race* in which *everybody* ran! *No* other country even came close, and it is *irresponsible* to insist, as some do, that they too “belong” in the government! Each “belongs” according to his capacity! It is an onerous duty, that *must* however be undertaken as part and parcel of being first: The world *must be told in no uncertain yet humble terms*. For it *has a duty to know where we all stand as well as a duty to advise* (not just jostle, cajole, flatter and shamelessly beg) *the philosophical and thus humble ruler!* All else is folly! Maybe, this US President, terse to the point of incomprehensibility by listeners untrained to exercise their critical thought as they listen, yet *truly more humble* than all others as I at least can remember, and capable even of a *sincere* public tear, *is* the best yet to address the issue to the world from the podium of the UN. There is no arguing the infinite pains he must take to prepare and present the argument!

The Near-and-Middle-Oriental Civilizational Pressure on the World in the Age of Globalization

The experience of Sept.11 was only the latest of a long series of actions *all* springing from Asia, source of *all* raids and hordes! Don't misread history: the grossest Asiatic actions are ugly, clear, direct, as was that of Sept. 11. The deadliest, however, *seem familiar*, are diffuse, unclear, dark, indirect, so sly as not to be believed they are acted at all, and thus difficult to detect! The actors, acting for *long years and centuries*, *never* appear and thus are never suspected! Only their agents! And unawares, *even we may* be their agents! Don't be shocked, just consider: Above suspicion, the Bin Laden family has for many decades been doing business American-style even with the Bush family! Now we chase the money financing terrorism, when we *know* that even *that money is in our entire system*, because *we*, willfully or not, have devised the means even for it to get safely washed—for a price! *Only now do we discover we have to pay additional costs* we never suspected were hidden in the process! *We thought* we were using them! We must now admit *at least one oriental party used us*! Welcome to oriental bargaining! Where unaware, the naïve westerner bargains even his soul! It can be *unbelievably much later* that he discovers he has *lost* it!

On the other hand, ask yourself: does Zionism exist or is it only pure myth? And are its actions direct or the sliest of them all? The greatest known contribution to the effort to defeat the *legal* election of this American President was made by an American Jew, member of the *Republican* Party! Why? Simply because the vice-presidential candidate of the *other* party was an American Jew! Question: Is there *any* doubt that these people have *other and hidden* allegiances than those they normally show, made apparent *only in extreme circumstances*, as was the one that *could if won* sit a Jew in the American Presidency? The previous administration had been infiltrated profusely by the Jewish minority, to the point of *callously exposing, for its benefit*, even the sexual weaknesses of the President despite *damaging* the picture of the entire country, a wholly murky affair in which the mother advised her daughter *to save the valuable damning proof, a free confession that confirmed the existence even of conspiracy*! The then candidate and now President had made it abundantly clear he intended to give his administration a more independent of such influences, in short, a more Christian, tenor! Is there any doubt that this *alarmed* the Jews? Question: Is there still any doubt that Zionism *exists and is not a figment*? Where then must we classify it now: among the direct or among the sly activities? Unpleasant question? We can ignore it! And continue to play the agent and unquestioning servant of the *other* party of Orientals! Oh, haven't we sold our soul! Globalization, we say? Now we find it is played in purely *Asiatic* terms! To which *we are forced* to react! *Will the never quite Christian West ever wake up*? I hope it now does! I am encouraged by the President's decision to remove even the

Congress, that *cove of anti-American PAC activity*, from the inner circle of *critical* information!

There has always been a question as to whether it is moral and practical to use minor thugs in the pursuit of greater ones, being it understood *desirable* to cut the human losses of the “good” part of humanity in the struggle against the “evil”, whatever the party (“us” always being the “good” ones) considering the question. Well, let’s see: Would God enlist the help of lesser devils to defeat the greater ones, being it understood that even the devils are at constant war against each other, or else hell *would be less hellish*? That *would also imply a weakness* in the power of Good to deal directly with evil! Answer: No, it is not moral or necessary of the *All-powerful Good God* to act in this manner! But *we are neither all-powerful, nor as good as He is*! What shall we do? Being human rather than holy, we cannot keep on turning the other cheek when the other party keeps on attacking ever more violently, and now even with planeloads of people and kerosene! Those that accuse us of the “sin” of not turning the other cheek *must first show us* where this particular “sin” is stated as *sin* [that as such is thus applicable to *all, not only some*, of us—thus carrying the *clear* admonition that we must not even *think* of slapping another who *may* turn the other cheek, in order not to put him at a disadvantage!] rather than as *advice* [having limits determined by the impudence of the insulting party], and then *prove* this rule *already faithfully obeyed by themselves*, setting the example beyond *all* limits of impudence! *We* are prepared to take our chances before God’s Supreme Tribune, letting it up to Him to assess, in all His Wisdom and Knowledge of minds and hearts, both our own ability to resist this “sin” if sin it be, and our “sinister calculation” in choosing to act in the manner our detractors call “revengeful and vindictive”! Are *they*? The rest is *wholly contemptible cheap talk*! If they are not, the detractors are shameless and dishonest! But *don’t* expect them to blush, their blood is green with envy! *We cannot and may not* (in order not to abet the wrongdoers in their evil habits) send humanitarian aid in the name of Christ to Afghanistan, when they, farmers *and* government, in the name of Allah thank us and the whole world with *undeserved* hatred, heroin, pushers, terrorism, death and cripples! The aid we send them is a *free offer of heart*, not an obligation of ethic or morality! Christ and Allah are only *our and their name of the same One God*, Whose nature does *not* change with the name we give Him commanding us to act in morally opposite ways! The use of lesser thugs to combat greater ones is *not* an entirely morally reprehensive behavior when our enemies, in their own belief of what is “good”, use *our* (the “devils” ’) *weaknesses and inclinations of kindness* to attack us. The old *so-called* command “eye for an eye” *was cut to the measure of Asiatic barbarity, alas still practiced* by the progeny of those that enacted it! *Both Asiatic parties concerned* have demonstrated for two thousand years that they do *not* understand Christ’s language! As no lesson can

be understood unless delivered in a language understood, it only remains that *they be treated by their own, no other command*, hard-hearted that they are *above all the rest* on this sinful planet!

The great difficulty arises when you postpone dealing with the evil forces you have thus used for so long that they themselves become a worse and deadlier institutionalized source of evil. I am confident we have *not* handled wisely this problem, that we now find looming against us! We thought we used the “Jewish science” to defeat the enemy in World War II. *The sly theory, as you already know, was false! It only took advantage* of the God-made *nature* of the world, Whom the sly theory *still* seeks to render “useless”! The “Christian science” *is still fast asleep!* We did *not* need the theory of relativity to learn that the “mass deficit” *was* turned to energy! The evidence *was all there* since the discovery of radioactivity, coupled with the *fact* that *no energy can even be comprehended without its corresponding mass that carries it!* I cannot help feeling that the refusal of the “scientific” (*not scientific*) establishment to admit these and all other *facts* I have put right under their nose has to do with *their refusal to confess God*, and our (or *their*) unwillingness to let us come out from under our “debt” to the Jews for helping in the construction of the bomb that gave us the victory! Then, we had to use Mr. Bin Laden to combat in Afghanistan the spread of communism, that had been created on the *false* teachings of another Jew, Carl Marx! We now find that the communists in Eastern Europe were mostly of *Christian* extraction and thus, by comparison, not all that bad, for they finally admitted their system dead! At the time, we had thought that a *possible* war with the USSR would bring us to the End! We had not realized that such a war *was in fact impossible!* And not only because neither side was that insane, but also because it would have been about *means, not purposes!* Economic theories, as ours and theirs, are only *means*. The war that *can and perhaps will* bring the world to the End can *only, as befits, be centered on the nature and rights of God and Good* in a world freely bent on doing evil! Geographically, we have the Middle and Western Asiatic conception of God-in-the-service-of the unspeakable passions of the barbaric clan, and the Western conception of God as *One Pure Logical Person that is also the Spirit of Truth, Light, Justice and Love*, above all “human” (of/from the *humus*) passions! If *those* passions and *that other* conception of God are not contained, this clash shall involve billions, fighting *in fact about the nature of God!* We now find we have just begun paying the oriental loan, *having let ourselves become the agents of one Asiatic horde* against another! Not wise, but befitting a *still sleeping, not quite Christian* West! Perhaps, too, we are being attacked because *we are strangers in their bazaar* and it is not quite honorable even among Asiatic half-brothers to attack each other directly when proxies, such as offer themselves, are available to deal and receive the blows! Even less wise of us!: There is *no* question that the

treatment of Iraq since 1990 *would have been different, if* Arabs and Jews were not at war and the Jewish lobby in the West were less effective! Just as there is *no* question that Mr. Bin Laden chooses to attack *Americans* for their presence in Saudi Arabia, *not* the Saudis who invited them! So, this clash is *not* so much between rich and poor as between *civilizations*! That the “rich” belong in one civilization and the “poor” in the other is *a resultant not the determinant* of the civilizational difference! All else is dishonest and evil misconstruction!

While the first invasion of Asiatic hordes recorded in the books as history was that of Persia against Greece, the *still earlier true first and still continuing*, described as “holy history” is (are) the *westward peregrinations of Abraham and his descendants, whose true (not quite unstated but no less true on the Jewish side, and now clearly restated, on the Arab side) objective is to sit upon the entire world as befits the “‘chosen’ people of Abram-Abraham, father exalted of many”* (i.e., of God, recognized as *sole Father* exalted by many, *not* by all)! *Conveniently forgotten here by both sides, and totally foolishly by the Christians*, is the *naked fact* that the *broad class* of “people of God” has been narrowed to a *clan, either this or that*, as the name Abram-Abraham has been attributed to a particular man by his descendants on both sides, and has not been reserved strictly for God, in total disregard of the parable in Lk. 16.19-31, where Lazarus *cannot* have been meant in the bosom of the *man* Abraham but of *God* (cf. Mt. 23.9)! *Don’t* be shocked, just consider the facts surrounding the claimed inheritance! The Arabs, taking themselves to be sons of Ishmael, *natural* first-born of Abraham, *are ever since at war against the Jews*, who regard themselves sons of the “legitimate” second-born Isaac. It is according to the *biased* Jewish Scripture that Isaac is believed “legitimate”! Objectively, he *usurped* (or rather, *his descendants* usurped for him, but in truth for *themselves*!) the rights of the first-born at an *eolegal* time when, in the Bedouin “society” in which *they all* belonged, there was *no* distinction between natural and legitimate, *all legitimacy being recognized only on the part of the father*, a tradition still continuing (though not for only this very reason) only among the Arabs and Moslems, who have an ax to grind, but discontinued at a *later* time (in all probability due to “heathen” influence) among the Jews, who need this very ax *permanently hidden*, in order not to yield the rights of the first-born to Ishmael & Sons! [Remember how Jacob was deceived to marry Leah before Rachel: the *complete* covering of women's faces is an *honored ancient* tradition in all those parts, *not a later Islamic* development, and shows *how little not only the face but the entire person of the woman* has traditionally counted there! Remember also the controversy surrounding the genealogy of Jesus, that is beclouded solely for the *peculiar and mixed* patrilineal and matrilineal systems of heredity.]

America's and the West's only Long-Term-Safe Civilizational Defensive Attack

It was with *that still continuing* strife in mind that this war was waged against America!: If the sons of Ishmael defeat America with the religio-legal psychological support the Koran gives them, the world will be theirs and they will not have to deal directly with the other claimants, the sons of Isaac! America was attacked on *both* accounts: that of being the leading power of the world, and that of being the proxy of Israel and the Jews! Now there can be no question that, America *is forced* to resolve this age-long Asiatic, first bedouin, then national, now *international and always religious* imbroglio involving billions of people, *centered exactly on God Whose quality of "Exalted Father of many" has been usurped by two antagonistic clan-nations, hating each other to the death over "their" rights on the entire world, despite the third temptation of Christ! Both Jews and Arabs would have to give up the dream of that inheritance in order to believe in Him! An "unacceptable" surrender! The Jews chose to stay with the religion that promised them the world! The Arabs, much later, adopted a religion finally made to their measure, in pursuit of that same objective!* [So, my anger against my branch of Christianity for its failure to Christianize the East has to be softened—and *only* God knows how to dispense Justice!] In all this affair, the Hebrews and now the Jews do hold center stage, as *theirs* is the Scripture *written at a much later time*, that describes the origins of all this strife. *They may no longer say that such is their fate as Chosen People! They have been among us for long enough to know that, ultimately, all religions and all Paradises are cut to fit, exposing naked the spirit of the people to whom they fit!* So, to say "but such is our fate", is to expose the *unwillingness to surrender that false old claim*, now shown to be the cause of the clash of civilizations! Look: The Koran *based on the Old Testament cannot stand on itself!* How then will the Moslems stand the moment the Jews declare the point about the "People of the Exalted Father" *moot as traditionally interpreted* (in other words, the Old Testament *false as regards the wording of all passages leading to the traditional interpretation*) because *all people are that People*, because the "Exalted Father" was *not* (the name of) a particular man but *only* (another name of) God? In face of this War of Civilizations, *all others will legitimately say* that a Jewish refusal to declare the point moot *will scandalize the world*, in Christ's sense of the word, now that the awesomeness of the scandal is starkly clear to all! The Jews and all *must* understand that this *Jewish* demarcation of peoples by *them* entered in the (*not* in this regard Holy) Scripture *also affects but is not binding on the rest of the world!* *This* is where the knot is, and *that* knot must now be resolved! And it fully befits the greatness of America as present leader of the world and prime guardian of all its civilizations, to insist, as now *hers is the duty to do despite her reticence on matters religious*, that the matter *be faced and resolved!*

America *cannot, may not* leave this task up to others! If not she, *nobody* will resolve this knot! It is *she* that *can and must bring all needed pressure* on the Jews to yield the point of “the People of God” *as* discussed above, there being *no better acceptable* resolution!

As Judaism was the first recognized monotheistic religion in the world, the Jews must now be the first to face point by point this next problem about God.

First point: If He is All-powerful, *is He or not* powerful enough to appear on earth *as a human being*? If not, *what is* that other power that so delimits the power of the *One All-powerful God*? As *no such* other power can be produced, *the Jews must declare God capable of appearing on Earth as one of us!*

Second point: Do they or not still accept as valid their tradition regarding the Coming of the Messiah? Can they afford to say they do not?

Third point: Accepting the *ability* of God to *come* in the world in human form, accepting the *validity* of their tradition regarding the Coming of the Messiah, and considering the *kind* of the Coming itself of the Messiah, is there a way to conceive these *two* Comings as *separate in kind and time of each other*; and if not, mustn't they rather be regarded as *one* Event, *one* Coming? The short answer is that *there is no such way!* The *only* option is to regard the two Comings as *one!* As the Old Testament speaks of *only one* Coming, that of the Messiah, now that we recognize God's ability to come in human form, we *must* conclude that (for that ability to have *practical* value, i.e., *in order for it not to remain a theoretical-only ability* that as such would delimit the power of the All-powerful God) God's own Coming *is part and parcel* of the Coming of the Messiah! Therefore, the traditional Jewish expectation of a Messiah *other* than God Himself, having a purpose *other* than the *highest God could and would assign to Himself as befits His stature*, is false! The traditional Jewish expectation that the Messiah will come to sit the *mortal* “chosen people of God” on all other *mortal* peoples on this *mortal* tiny planet *cannot but be false*, because *such passing objective cannot be God's highest consideration, worthy of His personal visitation!* *Such passing objective would be better served if He let the peoples fight it out among themselves without His Coming*, a fair struggle being the best tool to resolve the winner's quality! It *cannot* be Just God's desire to come personally to sit another than the best! Surely, such considerations about God and men are *not* beyond the ken of the rabbis of Israel! They, too, understand that as in the long run we all shall be dead by design, *even war among mortals is inconsequential*—unless it be fought for an *immortal* purpose! As also that morally, rather than to die after a *wholly purposeless* life such as those guided by “clever” existentialist pseudo-philosophers strive to attain, it is far better to die in war over an *immortal* objective! As also that, *no* objective worth dying for is higher than the one that concerns the *nature and quality* of God and Good! Therefore, the rabbis of Israel *can* understand that the *one* Coming of God-Messiah *cannot*

be unrelated to the strife of Good and evil that ultimately refers to His own nature and quality! As also that in such an Event, *God cannot but be personally present—and in mortal human form, too, as the Messiah*, since by mortal men on this Armageddon-Earth is the battle being fought!

Fourth point: Having thus dismissed the traditional (Jewish) purpose of the Coming of the Messiah as false, the Jews are *obliged and free(!)* to re-examine all possible candidates, *including Christ*, Whom a large part of humanity has already accepted as *the Messiah*. But what *is the necessary and sufficient criterion* that *must* determine the quality of *God-Messiah as a human person*? What other than *total and absolute sinlessness and testified to, special, solely benevolent personal qualities and powers, that together fit God uniquely, yet fall within our ability to discern them as such*, or else His Coming would pass unnoticed?

Fifth point: In all of human history, not just the Jewish one, has there ever been a person better qualified other than Christ? Consider:

That He came among the Jews was certainly an asset: *They* were the sole monotheistic nation; *they* had a strict Law regarding sin and sinfulness though at the *human* level; *their* lawmen were sticklers on matters of observance as to the letter and spirit of the Law; and *He alone* challenged them to put Him, *and they did*, under *their* microscope on the matter of sinlessness! [*There is a critical reason why Christ ought to challenge them to test His sinlessness: On such challenge and test rests the entire construction!* For it determines not only a *cardinal* quality of God-Messiah, but also the *possibility* of Man to attain the *resemblance of God even in sinlessness*, that was *fully realized* in the person of Jesus, and therefore, sets the *entire* relation of man to God! A sinful Jesus is *not* the Christ! *This point being pivotal, His challenge of them mentioned in the Gospels must be taken as true!* Just as there is a reason why He came among *them*, to whom *first* He said He came to save the lost sheep! *Only those that know the Law yet break it* commit the greatest sins and, so, *more than all others are lost sheep*, that, despite, *also deserve* salvation, for so the Holy God decrees and *no* man may object! When the people of the Law reject the offer on the belief that they, knowing and having “kept” the Law, “cannot” be more lost than all others, they *in fact* put themselves *above* God in deciding who most needs salvation! At the time of Christ, it was *only the Jews then living that rejected* the offer. Today, there is no people on earth that can honestly state they don’t know what sin is and what God expects of sinners! Today, *we all need salvation*, and today’s Jews *must not be more embarrassed than all others* whose fathers have also committed blasphemy in the eyes of God! *We all are* more or less equally sinful and only God may resolve the difference, if it exist and be worth resolving. *We must* bend our heads! The Lord shall honor the repentant of the eleventh hour as well as that of the first!] But the first time they tried Him, they committed a series of very serious mistakes: Having never before set down

all the above considerations, they did not realize (a) That the Judgment of a possible Messiah is intrinsically different from all earlier judgments in their experience! (b) The fact that in every judgment both sides are being judged, the accused for a possible breaking of the law, the judge(s) for a possible misapplication of the law in the case of the particular accused, even as only the former is finally declared guilty or innocent! (c) That situation (b) becomes particularly onerous for the judge(s) when, and exactly because, the trial is final for the accused! (d) That situations (b) and (c) together become infinitely more onerous under (a), i.e., when a possible Messiah is being judged, who will be misjudged if judged solely on ordinary human grounds rather than on the grounds uniquely applicable to the case of the real Messiah! As a result, they examined Him as they knew from earlier experience, solely on the human level! It was by the human criterion that they “found” Him sinful for claiming to be the Son of God, as they took it to be a blasphemy for a man to do so! But even on the human level, were they not all, and are we not all, children of God, Who alone took the infinite pains needed for us to come into being out of nothing? After all, relative to those pains, what are the pains of an earthly father? Had He not told them how correctly to regard the question of Fatherhood, as we all have only one Father, that in Heaven? Is there another, better way to regard the matter even if only on the human level? But in light of the five points listed above, do we not now see clearly that in judging God-Messiah-Man, the human criterion alone does not suffice, that the godly one is also needed? That a possible Messiah must be judged at once both on the human and the divine level? Had He, by coming among them and conducting an altogether extraordinary life and exposing Himself with deeds and words to their scrupulous scrutiny, thus not given them expert lawmen adequate time to consider this all-important matter of Father-and-Sonhood that constitutes the most pertinent question about Truth both within and beyond the human measure, from which we humans must start in examining the whole of Truth? What new element have we introduced here that was not already available then? So indeed, how holy is a “Holy Scripture” that nowhere discusses the possible Coming of God Himself, but only of a certain ill-conceived-and-defined Messiah, who once come is judged on the basis of such “Holy Scripture” misleading the judges that let themselves be misled to judge Him not by the true Man-Theological but solely by the traditional human-legal measure to the exclusive use of which all “legal” testing had up until then restricted itself? An ordinary man, sinful in so many ways as we all are, would certainly lie if he assigned to himself the quality of the Son of God on the divine level, i.e., with the connotation of sinlessness firmly attached! But only if you regard the man in question ordinary and his sinfulness unquestionable for his being ordinary has the point its value (shown once over in court, by the lie of his claim to sinlessness)! But the point loses its value completely when judging

God-Messiah-Man, because *God never lies*, and so, not even when judged for *being God-Messiah-Man*! The judges *ignored totally this “detail”* and took the statement of Christ’s divine identity as another lie of an *ordinary man*, *despite the evidence of His entire public and private life, laid naked before them for examination, that had already shown Him to be no ordinary man, but to have passed all tests on the purely human level*! There had remained *only* the test of Truth regarding His identity on the *divine level, clearly beyond the up until then ordinary limit*, based on sinfulness, of man’s ability to testify to, *not only when under charge, but also as judge*! Yet it was *solely on the man charged that the judges objected to*, to whom (in this case to Whom) *alone* they attached as *sin* what they regarded, in light of the *human measure*, to be the legal “weakness” of His case in the matter under question, the *narrow question of His identity seen apart from His entire private and public life on earth, unquestionably testifying to an altogether other origin*! Judging by general pre-misconception is *misjudging*! That the majority of a group of people are criminal does *not* justify to regard *every* member of the group criminal! That all *ordinary* men on earth are sinners does *not* justify the attachment of sinfulness to a *possible* Messiah, *unless you both expect him too to be ordinary and thus a sinner and ignore the total evidence of his entire life*! But this speaks *solely of the quality of the governing Theology and of the judge(s), not of the quality of the accused*! As to the accused, they ought *not to leave unexamined* the evidence of His *entire private and public life on earth, that proved His sinlessness, and thus the Truth of His statement of origin, which sounds as blasphemy without that evidence*! They had before them *all tests* of sight, hearing, taste and touch of His *solely* benevolent acts—acts *unique in all their history as regards their great concentration in one person, and a person acting in His own authority at that*! As far as human experience could reach, they had before them a *unique man already beyond all human measure of sinlessness and benevolent ability*. The *only* other measure was God’s own: He declared He could rebuild “*this* House of God” in three days! They thought He meant the stony Temple; they did *not* seek to determine *where God-Messiah-Man on earth would dwell in*; whether a temple made of stone and mortar was more or less befitting Him than a *living temple, His own human yet not man-made strictly sinless body—sinless as only God Himself and no man could certify to*! Their Theology had not yet advanced to such level! It had remained on the level of traditional Law and the strictures of *ordinary human Jewish life*, and they judged as if *that Law and those strictures alone applied even to God as God on earth, as God-Messiah-Man*! Now that Theology *has* advanced [and if the Jews, after having spent two thousand years among the Christians and read these lines, have any valid points on Christ’s total sinlessness and the need of us all of salvation, *now* is the time to bring them forward!], we see *clearly* that the “weakness” lay *not* on the side of the Man charged, but

solely on the side of His judges! They decided He had come not from God but from the devil, simply on account of His claim of His divine origin, *ignoring all the evidence* of His life!: The devil *and all that possibly come from him* certainly have *solely one* aim, to *deceive*, as *only that* does his name certify to! If he so chooses, the devil *may do good for a time—if that fits his purposes*! But would he be prepared to *do only benevolence for life and be ready to die for it*? Would *that* benefit him, or *solely* God? Certainly *not* him! But if God, not only he as devil does not profit ought, but also *he in fact ceases to be devil*, as that kind of saintly life, known to come solely from God, *returns all graces to Him and thus deceives no one*! What sort of “devil” is then a man that himself earns only death and self-denial as devil, with all the profits accruing to God? The judges *ignored* the trap *they* set to themselves! What they did next is known, and they were forgiven for it. No Christian worth his salt shall second guess Christ on the Cross.

The question we now face is whether *the Jews themselves* are prepared to *re-examine* that trial, in light of the present day and impasse with *all* theological and other knowledge now at *their and our disposal*! Now, the matter resurfaces as an urgent need for the survival of civilization! If, on re-examining the case in light of the above suggestions, they find *no* valid point against Christ, they *must accede to the Logical Need to accept Him* as God, and they then *can* proceed with full rights to show even us Christians some points we have overlooked! God knows we are far from perfect, for all our faith in God-Messiah-Christ-Man! If they produce no valid point, yet insist on *rejecting* the Logical Need to accept Christ as God, they *must confess* they insist on being the *primary and main* source of the present conflict, no longer on Theological grounds but in pursuit, regardless of cost, of their claim on the entire world, *even as they thus prove themselves not to be the “chosen people”*, using the “Law” (*solely* for providing the “justification”) as fulcrum and the USA as lever and hand! The knot *has* come to the comb! We *must* have some *honest* statements of intent by *all* people involved! I do very much hope the Jews will not decline to oblige us, for I very much do not want to think of the day after!

Now *all* stand before the Tribune! *All* are watching! *All are being judged, including the Judge Himself*! Let this small contribution be *His* advocacy! Some years ago, I. F. Stone (if I remember correctly his name), an American Jew (or Jewish American—*his* choice), had an altogether admirable impulse: He taught himself ancient Greek in order to study the existing original sources and proceeded to write a book titled *The Trial of Socrates*! In so doing he gave an excellent lesson to the Athenians, whose duty must be deemed *to have the case re-tried* in light of the best we now know about it. Now, the (*also ironically* acting) historical circumstances demand that the favor be returned: an Athenian-born Greek American asks present-day Jews to re-examine the Trial of Christ! Above,

a template/frame of ideas is offered pertinent to that case. More than that *I cannot and shall not* do—nor do I think more is needed! I shall *not* try to get any more into *their* shoes! The rest is up to them! They *cannot* just refuse to act! Much too much *is* at stake! Nor may they feel coerced! Because, correcting the travesty of *facts* that have led to the greatest ever miscarriage of Justice and weigh as crucially on civilization (now threatened) as religion (*misshapen* on *misunderstanding* God and our stance vis-à-vis Him), in order that it not be a sham, *must spring freely from an inner need and longing to release oneself and humanity* from their multifaceted crushing historical burden that we *cannot* otherwise be rid of in a unified world where *all* half-measures, including coercion, are a sham! We Christians simply *cannot* let the quality of the Theological discussion be determined by the mullahs teaching the Taliban! Can the Jews? There is one thing they definitely *cannot* do: And that is to excuse a refusal on the grounds that they now have insufficient evidence of their own, practically all extant evidence being Christian and written in Greek. But Greek *is* an asset, it leaves a very great deal less, if anything, in doubt than does Hebrew, written only in consonants! An asset written by Jews *turned Christian, on the evidence!* An asset *not* an obstacle, when the rest of them took no interest in the case—or *avoided it altogether!* Such an excuse will *not* wash! The Old Testament *they too use* rests *entirely* on the Translation of the Seventy, a Greek text written by Jews in the third century B.C., as *no reliable earlier or later* Hebrew copy survived the expulsion from Palestine! And that has *never* been a reason for them to reject the Old Testament as of doubtful origin! [By the way, mortal men fleeing for their lives are excused for being unable to save their texts. But why did even God let go of them? *How do they prove* that it was *not* God's will that the (*not*) original Hebrew text of His own Writ *be* lost in the flee? If it were not God's will, *what other* power overcame God's will? Troublesome, but a question!] With the Jews brought in the Christian fold (please, just don't tell me in advance, I wish!), the Moslems shall be exposed to the untenable position of insisting on a Koran based on texts *theologically entirely superseded* after God-Christ's Coming to earth, that obviates *all* later prophets, including the one that turned the Holy God's embrace in Heaven into Brothel; *thus solely in order he (not He) gather wily followers!* It surprises me that not only no-Moslem has objected to this altogether unpardonable construction over the long centuries, but also that there has not yet been a single prominent honest Moslem abandoning Islam in disgust for just this *sufficient* blasphemy of Holy God! Has it been *solely for misguided "politeness"* or *also for unbelief* that no-Moslems have avoided to show the point, *despite the blasphemy they thus hide?* And is such the grip the mullahs command on *all* Moslems?

The Inspiring Meaning, coming in from the Future, of a Defensible Civilization

All this very long discussion would be strictly superfluous and even useless, even as it *appears* to speak of morality, civilization and theology, unless it *can* demonstrate its usefulness in serving a purpose *objectively lasting beyond this life*! Any discussion, even of the highest order, having as sole purpose *only the control of this life*, is constrained *by and within* the bounds of *this life*, and so is *no* better than the *passing* nature and structure of this life in the service of which it is set, and thus *is set* to die out with it, and therefore is *no* superior to *any* other such discussion, however trivial, claiming the same objective, especially when the benefits of each are long in coming, possibly beyond the limits of the natural discussants. Therefore, in order that any such discussion lay claim to the reader's greatest attention, it must at least indicate how its field extends *beyond this life*, to where *all value ultimately must contend for its real laurel*! So, here is another angle from which the doings and philosophy of men must be seen!

Of all common materials, diamond is the most valuable. But would/could/should it keep its value, were common rocks made of it? Should it even then be insisted upon that diamond can never lose its value, because its value is *sufficiently* vested in *being* a diamond? But who then (assuming that some survived the *terrible* struggle for *insatiable* possession) could afford not a house but even a hut? Not a rock as a pillow for his head, but even a small rock as a paper-weight helping to keep his thoughts together in the face of the howling wind? Is it always true that surfeit causes devaluation, or are there exceptions? Reread these lines, understanding that diamond now stands for man. Should it then be true to say that here indeed we have an excellent exception, for the reason that contrary to what is said of diamonds, valued for rarity, size and quality, the (*believed* "irreducible") value of (each and every single) man is *exactly and sufficiently* in *being* a man, equal in value to every other man (and to the rest of mankind, as some say), i.e., regardless of the *number* of men alive, or the ease with which they come into being, or their natural and cultivated qualities, or station in life, or usefulness, uselessness, contribution and harmfulness to the rest of mankind and its purpose and to the universal objective!? Where is the Justice in all this?

[And how is the value of man kept undiminished if there be no value beyond this *passing* life? How could the value of each withering blade of grass be kept undiminished?—Mind you, I am *not* here attempting to subvert the accepted norms on the value of men, but only trying to set the stage for the reasoning that follows! If even that be disallowed, we may as well surrender the entire attribute of reasoning we possess and *all* graces flowing therefrom! But we must know that we shall not then be able to take another single step forward: as *that* will be

the cost of our satisfaction with our being what we *think* we are, *not* necessarily *are*, already! The followers of all three monotheistic religions take their cue from the command in Gen. 1 28 (“Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it!”). But do we understand that the command *has* consequences? And do we consider them *all*? The command does *not* state *how fruitful we must be, how much to fill the earth!* Is this because God *failed* to consider the limit of His command? Or is it because He wanted *us* to consider and set that limit? So far, we have been acting as though the command recognizes *no* limit and we are *not* to question the consequences! That our packing was *meant* to be chest to back, like canned sardines! But men would/could *not* possibly let themselves get so packed before resorting to war! Was then war in *Merciful/Loving* God’s plan, or the inevitable consequence of its absence? And how is the absence of limit to be understood *without* questioning on a *limited* planet, *unable* to sustain an unrestrained fruitfulness and multiplication? Or are we to “understand” that man was created to be no different and act not differently from animals constantly searching for food, when *clearly* for his mental/spiritual *God-given* qualities man *does not, cannot* feed on bread alone? Shall we call the question “subversive” and the investigation of its consequences (that include *even the present* impasse!) “undesirable”? Shall we hide in *forced* silence the *blasphemy inexorably implied* in the/(our) *interpretation* that the command recognizes *no* limit? The *so-called* “theologians” of *all three* monotheistic religions, rather than considering the question to *avoid* the blasphemy, resort to *blessing* the arms of war, thereby *accentuating* it! Rather than *demanding that we determine our fruitfulness by our ability to feed our children*, our respected “theologians” (of both theistic *and* atheistic religions) *invent and attack* the “enemies” that, *acting naturally*, resist our expansion into their territories, to which we resort in order to feed our children, *before exhausting to the fullest* the potential of our own land to feed us! *Don’t* fail in this connection to consider the stance of the *silly* world Left *siding with the invaders even of their own lands*, *supposedly* in the name of “world peace without frontiers” (*also* read as “better a *slave* than dead”), who at the same time *attack vehemently* the effort to produce disease resistant seeds for the fear of a *possible* future catastrophe while *ignoring* the *certain* present danger of world famine if no such seeds are produced and the world population is left free to multiply to its own insatiable sexual content—under the blessing of Heaven! And we *unreasoning* sheep follow them all—all the while pretending to be both pious and intelligent!]

How does all this really constitute proof incontestable that, of all common things, *not* diamond but *man* is the most valuable? The statement could *perhaps* keep its value *if* it were made by a *non* human—as self-interest would then be removed as a *hidden* factor. If it were made by a human, it could *not* avoid the charge of *proving* the ultimate racism! What then are we to say: that lesser

racisms aren't permitted, but the ultimate one is? What is the unique value of man as a superior species deserving the ultimate racist distinction? Why shouldn't even ants make an *identical* statement about themselves? What really do *we* know of ant feelings, self-esteem, social structure, civilization, or even ant ultimate usefulness in the large scheme of things, that allows us to make the distinction in our favor? I can feel the uneasiness, especially of the theologians! But I ask: where is at least *their* sense of Justice? The Lord came to us because we were/are lost sheep deserving of salvation, *for the fact, and despite the fact that we are sinners*, for were we sinless salvation would *not* be an issue as we *would then be saved by right!* If our salvation was the only reason for the Lord's coming (and our theologians have advanced none other), were we not sinners, His coming *would be unnecessary*, as the Lord does *not* do useless things! (Almost?) by definition, ants and all other *so-called* "lower" forms of life are sinless! Ergo, the reason the Lord did not come to them is their sinlessness! But aren't the sinless *more* deserving than the sinful? Where then, I repeat, is the theologians' sense of Justice in declaring *us only* deserving of Paradise? In the desire to avoid the accusation both of injustice and racism, would it then be right to say that both men and ants are right in insisting on the rights of their several species, thus for the reason that *all* life is sacred? But isn't even lettuce just another form of life, *equally* deserving of *total* protection? Do I hear the objection that lettuce is seasonal and replenishable, and thus less deserving? What right do we have to cut it *before it withers naturally?* And aren't ants *and* men *also* replenishable? Do I hear that "but we *have* to eat in order that we survive! The lettuce survives even as we cut it, and after all it serves its purpose by feeding us!"? In the first place, *no* individual lettuce survives cutting! The lettuce that grows to shed seed is *not* edible! In the second place, what sort of excuse for *necessary* "murder" is this *our dependence on others for survival?* In *no* court of justice on earth is a murderer's *identical* argument recognized as valid! It seems to many that if we cannot survive on our own but at somebody else's vital expense, we simply have no right or business in being! In the third place, if the lettuce fulfills its purpose by being eaten, how do we dare provide this excuse *without* also explaining how *we fulfill our* purpose by eating it—*what* do we say *is* our purpose? But if *each species and specimen* are to be protected for their several sacredness in the interests of justice and of avoidance racist attitudes, is it not now obvious that the recognition of sacredness of *all* forms of life simply for being alive *leads directly to death of all forms of life* (except possibly those, if there be any such, that can feed *unaided* on totally lifeless materials) and thus to cancellation of the very sacredness on account of which we declared abstinence from organic food? How are we then to relax further the rule of sacredness, in order to bring it in line with the *need of survival at least of some* forms of life, so that universal death *not be the just rule?* If the "right to life of the alive" is *not and cannot be*

the universal rule of justice applicable to *all* cases, it seems to me that the only other universal criterion, applicable to *both species and specimens* is their ability to produce products of (ever)lasting value, i.e., value extending *beyond* the time constraints applicable to *both specimens and species*—either this or we *must* forget all about Justice, whether here on earth or beyond! For were their products subject to such constraints, their value would be as durable as the life of the specimens and species, and thus of entirely *subjective* quality, *not* superior to the “right to life of the alive”! Can anyone suggest an (ever)lasting value that is not *exclusively* applicable to a *spiritual* product? But then can spiritual products even exist at all separate, beyond, outside spirits that *can* produce, evaluate, preserve *in themselves* and ultimately enjoy them? What then are we to state conclusively, if this line of reasoning is not to drown in its own perplexity? What other than that only those species and specimens are deserving of life (at the expense of others) that *are also spiritual* (i.e., *beyond* the constraints of the *otherwise truly purposeless* ordinary life of the alive, that is called “purposeless” exactly by those that *deny the spiritual extension* of ordinary life) *and can* produce such products of (ever)lasting value? But who is to decide such momentous (ever)lasting qualities and *by them* the value of living individuals? Certainly, *not* the individuals under question! There remains *only* God! *What* then are we to say about us, *alone subject* to this kind of *substantial spiritual* criticism?: What other than that we *respect* species and specimens *both intrinsically capable of producing, and causing to produce*, (ever)lasting spiritual values! And not only that, but that we *also strive both as individuals and societies to advance not only the likelihood of producing, but also the production itself of* (ever)lasting spiritual values, as it is *not the mere potential* of producing but the *fact* of production of such values that determines the *true* right to viability! *This then must be the final and ultimate* criterion for comparing the quality of civilizations!

But this has yet to be recognized as *the* criterion by which *any* civilization has *ever* sat down to size up itself! As a species and as separate races, nations, castes or classes we may *not* keep on producing human specimens to which we do not instill the *socially transmittable part* of (ever)lasting spirituality that supplements and *fulfills* the *natural* part of it with which we all come to life! Even less may we poison our children with teachings of *any lesser quality*, including *all so-called* “theological” teachings of overt and covert hatred! *No* individual, society or nation in the West or the East is immune from this danger, that leads directly to strife; but those nations and societies are more subject to it in which *individual people are not recognized as wholesome sacred entities* (in which *alone* the spiritual activities/processes take place, shape and form that only then become transmittable to other *similar* receivers) but only as “in themselves valueless” cogs of a “social body” (or “ecclesia”, or “nation of Islam”) retaining in itself all (claimed to be indivisible among individuals) value! We must confess

that *all* value, and especially the (ever)lasting spiritual value that *alone* transcends this life, is *not* kept in some *objectively nonexistent in itself* “social conscience” but in the *atomic consciences of individual people*, retaining in themselves the *indivisible and inalienable* (ever)lasting spiritual value! All other arguments and qualifications simply seek to impose a *spiritual* dictatorial regime, that is alien and inimical to the Spirit of God and Man! I understand the chagrin of both *so-called* theologians *and* atheists. The former had it coming right from the start: Because *despite* knowing better than all others God’s Law, that *needs* Reason, *they* are the principal blasphemers for *separating* God from Reason and thus offering *empty lip service*, instead of blessing! The latter can dismiss all this “argument from (ever)lasting spirituality” *only* if they dismiss *all spirituality—starting from their own*! As spirituality is *self-delusion* if assumed an epiphenomenon of matter limited to this life and world, since even the natural law is *not* an epiphenomenon but the *second, pure-spiritual-yet-needed, basic component* that *alone* gives matter its form and structure, they, ignoring these *facts* despite all their (own claims to) superior intellectuality (that is *nothing* without spirituality), are *no* better than illiterate street sweepers and peasants—or Fluffy my cat, or even the lettuce they eat! Communism collapsed exactly because it *denied* the value of the individual conscience! In the West, both church *and* atheistic authority is on the wane exactly because, and in the measure in which, people, recognizing their *inalienable obligation/duty/destiny* to think, mature and reap their own fruit for themselves, have begun developing another, *more wholesome* kind of spirituality much to the dislike of standing authority, that still locked in *past* dictatorial formalisms is unable to control it and unwilling to help it grow, choosing to *keep* a mentality that *prevents* them from rejoicing in this long-awaited spiritual flowering! In the Moslem East, under *oppressive, almost unified, religious and political control constantly and deliberately discouraging* individual thinking, this same process is *artificially and dictatorially* delayed, but *is* unavoidable for being contrary to the *spiritual* nature of Man, given him by God in *His* own image and likeness! Until this new spirituality takes root and blossoms everywhere, those that already have more of it are duty/destiny bound to be patient, carefully cultivate it in themselves and lovingly transmit it to those that have less of it and those willing to receive it along with its sacred burden! All the rest is unworthy of (ever)lastingness—in a word, trash!

It will be entirely *unproductive* to see the current clash solely in military rather than *civilizational* terms! It is the backward *civilization* that uses its own now *offensive* hatred of progress as shield and sword and self-excuse of billions kept in poverty! If the West keeps the strife solely within military terms, not only will it fight down at the *entirely unworthy* of its civilization level of its opponents, but it will play itself in *their* hands, as *they* keep multiplying uncontrollably! The war will produce a “winner” and a “loser”, but *not a more unified*

world! To that end, it must be fought in *spiritual* terms—and here proposed are the weapons of *our* side! Can better ones be proposed? The US Constitution instituted the separation of Church and State *solely for the sake of the unity of the latter*—the Constitutional Convention wisely did not consider themselves qualified to tackle the unity of the former, the time for which had not yet come! As no one worked to erase it, religious disunity still exists and now literally threatens the entire world—that *must* be united even religiously, if it is to be saved both physically *and* spiritually, which is impossible if religious war becomes the order of day! It is *no* good but positively dangerous to send soldiers to war to *unite* the world and civilians to churches, synagogues and mosques *that keep it apart*! If those presiding there could and would, they *would already have united religiously* the world! As they have not, they *neither could nor would*! Instead, they freely *chose and choose to keep it apart*—in the very least by doing *nothing*, by *conscious inaction* in the face of duty, in a world in which, *by design, action is the physical measure of all things*, and thus in which, *even inaction is action*! So, acting *profanely*, they attempt to unload the burden of resolving the *main* world problem, which is the division of men over *unreasonable* religious doctrine of their own invention, on God! They do *not* see that *by design this world along with its problems does not operate in terms of eternity* but in terms of time, now fast running out! And thus that, for the sake of the world, they *must* either call themselves back to duty, or else they *shall* be bypassed, as we may *not* fight for *both* ends of the argument! The US Constitution did *not* institute the separation of Churches and Faiths, it only decreed that they not interfere with the functions of State! Now we find that, *by and through their active inaction, Churches and Faiths do indeed interfere* in the well being of the Union! Internal religious strife persuaded the then Roman Emperor Constantine the Great to call the First Ecumenical Council! Not even then were the still *fresh* Christian religious authorities apt to convening on their own to resolve their differences! Now, the times are different: The US President is not a Roman emperor, but he *is* the First Citizen of the World—a *greater* honor! The present religious/civilizational problem was not caused within the borders of the US Union. It was thrust upon it from without—but caused problems within! The US President has no authority or authorization to call in Council the *world* religious leaders. But for the well-being of the Union over which he presides, he does have all the Authority of State needed to call into Domestic Council *all* religious authorities operating *within* the Union (which are essentially *all* faiths of the world) to resolve their differences *based on Reason and the avoidance of all blasphemy against the Holy God*! The rest of the world may participate, or they may watch from the distance! Whether or not the findings are accepted by the entire world shall depend on their spiritual power and cogency! At least America, the *New World*, shall have performed her ultimate duty before *all* men and God! As *she* put

down *in righting* the first ever political contract of *free* men, the principles of which are tacitly imitated everywhere as men become freer, so too *she must* lead the (*divided*) world (set in its *old* ways) to a *war-canceling* religious union, by setting down the *Reasoned* religious principles that in time shall also become universal for their *Reason*, the absence of which caused the first immigrants to come to her shores, that are now attacked by a world still bent on *old* religious war-making! That the US Constitution separated Church and State may *not* be construed as a *constituted indifference* over matters of religion, that now become pertinent to the existence of the State, but as a *need in the face of* the old religious division. Under a *Reasoned* religious doctrine, the State shall have nothing to fear from religious quarters, that shall be *Reason-bound* to respect the free will of *all* men, even when expressed on matters of politics! Not only religion *shall* thus improve, but *also politics*! Aren't the two the *main* intellectual/spiritual foundation/framework of *all* human *political* activity that inspired *all good* men since Socrates and Plato? How justified in her own eyes will be America if she ignores *this call of the present and future* and continues to *follow* others and their passions, while leading the world in a direction that *is meaningless* in the absence of a *spiritual* goal? Those others, sitting on *withered old laurels* that are *not* theirs in the first place but belong to *long since past* generations, accuse America of "arrogance" while *they are the arrogant ones accusing her* of "lack of culture"! What will *they* have to say after a move that *shall* expose *their* spiritual nakedness? That have the gall to come in the Country, but *not become part of the Union*, and to carve *for themselves whatever piece they can of its religious pie*, while calling "lack of culture" the very freedom the Country gives them to "dig in"? These are moments of Great History in the making and only spiritual nonentities may deny the call of the times! Unless we start from the main problem of God/Truth/Justice that keeps people apart, we shall *never if ever truly resolve any other* difference that ultimately hinges on one of Them! The first day of the rest of Eternity *is this one*! So, it *is* true to say that *today do we decide in the way uniquely given to mortals* the quality of Eternity left on! Shall we settle for less than the best? Rather, *we shall go for it*!

The Confusion over the Recent Events

Here in Greece, some terrible statements have been made by many sides, on evidence or "evidence" coming in from abroad, regarding the role of the Jews in the WTC disaster: All who know how the Jews mourn and take revenge for their losses were struck by both the *total* absence of Jews from the first scenes of shock and mourning, *and* the *total* absence of Jewish demands for revenge! These *are recorded facts*! Further, it has also been written that some Israeli newspaper(s) or their Internet publication(s) [point *unclear to me* as I was not then in Athens] stated during the first few minutes/hours after the disaster that the loss

of Jewish life was expected to be between four and five thousand, and that these Internet publications were later withdrawn. When these facts or “facts” appeared here, an Israeli Embassy or Jewish community spokesman was alleged to have offered the “explanation”, satisfying Greeks unable to test it and unwilling to think of the alternative, that “it was only natural for Jews not to be at work that morning of Rosh Hashanah”! But Rosh Hashanah fell this year on Sept. 18, *not* on Sept. 11 [per ScotiaBank calendar, Publ. Number: 1767216 10/00]! Then *I heard* that the Mosad *had* warned not only the Jews working at the WTC, but *also* the FBI, that, however, *failed* to take them seriously! Then *I read* that the FBI arrested in NY five Jewish people *having set their cameras as if in expectation of, ready to record*, the disaster! The “facts” of gossip may or may not be true. *The total absence (both in America and Israel) of public Jewish mourning (i.e., apart from the general mourning) and of clamorous calls (in proportion to the thousands of Jews that died, if indeed they died) for revenge is unquestionable and extraordinary!* And unless ScotiaBank misstated the holiday, Rosh Hashanah was *not* on Sept. 11! The European press has *also* referred to the *alleged* absence of Jews from the WTC on Sept. 11, but to my knowledge has *not* cleared the question of whether or not the Jews were absent, and if absent why, and if not absent *how many of them did* die! Now then the question *is* simple: Has a *final, complete and accurate* list of the dead and missing been published? And does it contain Jewish names *in broad proportion to the list of known Jewish employees* in the firms housed in the two Towers? When the news came of the President’s decision to *exclude* even members of the US Congress from the loop of truly sensitive intelligence, the inference clicked! Is it just possible that he no longer trusts the Jewish lobby there? How venomously he was objected to by the Jewish lobby both before and after the election is clear to all but the blind! So, has there truly been a conspiracy, involving even Jewish people that manipulated and abetted or at least just helped with vital information the Arab marionettes? Even the blind *can see* the *vital* Jewish interest in the affair: An American reaction certain to come *would postpone indefinitely* the resolution of the Palestinian problem! With the war on terrorism set to last long, the resolution of that problem may never come, given the manner in which terrorist groups act and double cross each other! Terrible questions? Terrible times! I do very much hope the Jews are found innocent, so that the resolution of the entire affair may focus on the Theological question, that *alone* can solve this conflict peacefully, *provided* that all people have enough self-respect as free and wholesome spiritual entities, *not* as slaves of priests, rabbis, mullahs, or dervishes, to face the question of their faith in God *based on Logos and not on their received expectations of some trumped up figment of paradisiacal indolent bliss!*

And now last but not least, the problem of the anthrax virus! It surprises me greatly that no serious discussion has yet appeared on efforts to eliminate what

ought to be the *easiest, i.e., internal* sources of it! How many universities, laboratories, pharmaceutical entities and others handle the little beast? Are they and the people they now employ and those known to have worked in the past on related projects so intractable? I find it unbelievable that the safety of those establishments has been so lax—or else the *secure elimination* of internal sources from the list of suspects is entirely inexplicable! If the danger is not what they say it is, why all the fuss? What's behind it all? [Can it be that the USA *is fired upon by both camps*, the one attacking the towers, the other sending the virus from within though publicly attempting to blame its enemy, in a *concealed* effort to suggest its own ability to create *true* havoc in case the USA adopts a more independent attitude on the Palestinian question, ability that the Administration does not dare admit in public? Surely, Mr. Saddam Hussein is *not* that crazy to have started this attack: *everybody would suspect him first and the Arab side would be the big loser*—and besides, the Administration has been unable to persuade itself that he was/is the culprit! On the other hand, if Mr. Bin Laden truly had the capability to use the virus on a wide scale, *he would already have done so*, and I do not see why he should attack *only selected public targets*, and then only on the East Coast and mainly in Washington, D.C., instead of spreading the virus all over the country by the same or any other method of secure effectiveness! And by the way, how do envelopes contaminate only mailrooms but not other envelopes also and mail boxes and post offices? And how do mailrooms contaminate only letters *sent in, but not those sent out* that *should contaminate mailrooms all over the country and the world*? Is it not more reasonable to suspect that *only some envelopes, directed in, are contaminated in the mailrooms, not those sent out, with some contamination spreading around*? The method of the viral attack suggests a *well controlled clear public warning sent only* to the Administration and those in charge of the news! I do very much hope the Administration have gotten the message, and will *not* capitulate to the blackmail! Sorry, if I sound so suspicious, but this is a *deadly* matter altogether different from any so far known or suspected, and *no* “enemy” or “friend” can be ruled out unless he be *proved* out!] Surely, the US Mail Service must from now on subject *all* items passing through to some sort of radiation able to destroy *this and all* viruses, they *cannot* be that resistant! Why do they not? Isn't this a *reasonable* internal shielding of the Nation against viral attack whether from within or without? A *professor* here suggested that we individuals immerse the mail, *after* we receive it, in 10% chlorine solution for at least five minutes! The virus may be destroyed, but so will the paper and what's written on it! You cannot but admit that some professors *are* clever! Some other said that (dry? wet?) ironing of *yet unopened* envelopes *weakens* the beasts! A process safer for paper and ink, but at *what temperature is the virus truly killed*? What do *you* say? As for the people running the universities, *they* have made it look like our democratic duty to edu-

cate (i.e., *instruct*) even the criminals! You know the proverb: like teacher, like student! The professorially spread virus of nihilism (in the classrooms it is called universal purposelessness) is at the root of *all* our problems! What if *I* holler? *Nobody* listens! Too busy, giving degrees to criminals! Professors (*some, only some? not most?*) and educated criminals (*all!*): the *double* pillars of our modern society!

Conclusion: Call to Terse yet Confident, because Faithful, Action

I think it a grave mistake trying to placate the conflict as something other than a clash of civilizations! The spiritual needs of humanity are *not* well served when the truth is hidden. The conflict must be presented as it truly is, though in a manner speaking to the *humanity* even of the howling Moslems and the most recalcitrant Zionists, that only thus may be brought into the fold of Reason! The Moslems (*and* the Jews, *and* the rest!) must be brought into the modern world, in which not even the Christians are fully entered! I regard the argument incontestable: God is *not* many, but *one*! And He is *not* this for me and that for you! He can *only* be a *Logical and Reasonable Pure Spirit and Person*! The *same* for *all*! *Only thus* do we accord Him the highest possible respect and honor! *All else is a lie*, that as such can only cause *great* damage! It is a beautiful duty and a supreme honor for America not just to lead the world in this war, but to extract all possible sweetness out of the present bitterness and mourning. The best advisers the President can have are *not* the politicians *nor* the political analysts *nor* the generals *nor* all sorts of sophists *nor* the historians of *past* philosophy that has brought us here *nor* the “philosophers” that regurgitate the *wrong* lessons of the past *nor* all sorts of “theologians” drowning in the morass of their own doubt and unbelief, but those who can take some crash lessons in the Philosophy of Tomorrow that alone can bring us to the Promised Land! For in only this way is History cyclical, ending up where it started out from: God. If we do not recognize God as *the Supreme Logical and Reasonable Pure Spirit and Person*, we shall never resolve this deadly problem, *far more serious than any faced before*: It is only fitting that it centers on God, circled by *all* men gripped in breathless attendance! So, let all wordiness, verbosity, prolixity, diffuseness and redundancy end right here! From now on, let all words we may utter be terse!

Our greetings to all,

(Re-editing ended on November 16, 2001).

Re: LETTER TO AMBASSADOR MILLER

The Honorable Mr. Thomas Miller,
American Ambassador
Athens, Greece

April 3, 2003

Sir:

As a US citizen living for some years now in this country and thus seeing the home affairs from the cool distance and meeting daily with ordinary people allowing me a better understanding of local and European sentiment, I feel obliged to bring to your attention not only my own great concern regarding the recent developments in Iraq, but also certain feedback and thoughts not normally had either by a US resident, or, and even less so, by persons loaded with the burden of running the affairs of state at home or from posts overseas. I hope you will not at this time be so burdened yourself as to be unable to pay the following matters the attention they deserve.

The problem an ordinary citizen faces attempting to raise a question, however serious, with a politician is that he gets the standard answer “this is not the time for it”! I understand that all citizens must support the national effort. *As it regards both the wellbeing and the honor itself* of the Country. I am concerned that in the case before us, our politicians, *driven by the forces driving them*, in their effort to serve the *Country’s wellbeing*, *have not, alas, paid the proper attention to her honor!* I understand that dissenting voices cannot be welcomed once a struggle such as the present one gets under way. Please be assured that I feel forced to question the means adopted to defend our wellbeing only because they harm the *honor itself* of the Country, the protection of which *is never out of season and must never be put aside!* On this point kindly allow me to stand my ground, for I, as an ordinary citizen, *cannot use* the standard “officialese” to evade questions, nor can I run and leave unprotected the honor of the Country, that our politicians have, alas, left exposed! Why do we forget that the great Roman emperors were not just conquerors but had *philosophers* on their side reminding them principally of their mortality and duty to *lay their own civilizing stone in memoriam?*

In times such as these there is exposed the main weakness of our presidential system of governance: The President *is just a man, not God!* As such, *he*

may not be expected to know all there is about everything! Surely *his* is the responsibility of picking his assistants. But by *what* logic must he and we regard *their mistaken advice* as his? And by *what* constitution is he obligated to follow *their mistaken advice* to the bitter end, especially when *only he may* be punished politically and they get away unscathed—only to return? Being a man rather than God, he must begin with the best advice of his team! But *their mistakes are not his and they cannot transfer upon him alone their burden! Unless he insists upon them even despite the evidence!* Accordingly, *he ought to feel obligated to fire his assistant(s) the moment their advice is proven to have led to blunders! In order not to compound the blunders!*

Moreover, in a world of *one-only* superpower, its president *automatically* becomes the President of the World, even as he has not been elected by the whole world! The whole world becomes *his* sacred trust! He *may not* shirk it! It comes with the spoils! *It* is the spoils! He *may not* permit himself to be driven by his team, nor indeed by his country, against the rest of the world! He *may not* let himself be swayed, as this President has been by Mr. D. Rumsfeld, who has acted as an old-world village mayor bent on imposing his *old-world* ways upon lesser villages, even as he accuses “Old” Europe for being “old”!

When the whole world protests the advice of his team, somebody must privately tell the President that he owes it to himself to reconsider the wisdom of his team! Nobody in his right mind will deny that Mr. Saddam Hussein of Iraq has committed high crimes against humanity. *But is it honorable to forget that we pushed him to war against Iran (when the then President followed the mistaken advice of his team), a war that in time led to those crimes?* Having decided to remove him we must now decide the magnitude of the cost not just in materials but also in lives, ours and theirs, *and see to it that it does not become as great or greater a crime!:* Materials contain also the human agony expended in extracting them from the raw earth! By what right do we turn them back to dust, whether they be just machinery or even ruins time has respected more than earlier barbarians that just passed through? Baghdad is one of the great cradles of world inheritance! Do we understand where we drop the bombs? And lives are expressions of the Spirit attempting to reach ever higher! Do we understand that removing them at will we profane God? To remove the one particular infant *Child* he feared, King Herod ordered the slaughter of *all* children under the age of two in the entire area of Bethlehem! Do we understand whose example(s) we follow? The preemptive strike against somebody *still innocent* who *may or may not* commit a crime against us tomorrow *is not at all a new doctrine, but an old Jewish one!* Why hasn't our Supreme Court been asked to pass on the justice, legality and morality of this *old Asian* doctrine that *we* now apply? As well as on *how* many of our own children-soldiers and Iraqis of all ages is *by our own standards today* either legal or moral to slaughter in trying to remove Mr. Hus-

sein? As well as on who will pay the cost when we meet the quota but fail in the main objective, or when we exceed the quota—not to forget the lesson from the *Merchant of Venice*? The President considers himself a born-again Christian, yet he adopts a policy that, if right, *ought to have led God to never bringing us into being for we surely would commit all the crimes of history!* Mr. Ambassador, *I am very sorry that I must ask:* Does our President regard himself and his team wiser than God? Or is now “God” just a mask for the raw power of our badly misguided republic that alone we now worship? The President considers himself a born-again Christian, yet he lets himself and with him the Country be swayed by the *Zionist Jewish lobby* [a very high member of which has just been forced to resign from his team for getting entangled in a financial mess also!] to follow the example of the *ancient King Herod, a Jew and an Asian equal to, if not worse than Mr. Hussein*, rather than the (pacifist?) advice of “Old” Europe!

Before these acts of its government committed in its name, when is the Nation, mindful at least of its own honor, expected to take action? *Why* isn’t the Country asked, after a *full* discussion, about the wisdom of our getting entangled in the familial hatreds and squabbles of the descendants of Abraham, whose birthplace we now bombard and *only* the Jews do not protest? From what is being leaked in the news media, the suspicion that our government *was cunningly dragged* into these wars in order that by its own *forced* actions in the battlefields *cover the crimes of Israel in Palestine* (as no one would dare drag American officials to the World Court for crimes against humanity) is not entirely without foundation!

The Nation has long since decided to defend the state of Israel. This alienated the rest of Near-and-Middle-East, that had absolutely no other reason to be inimical toward the USA! The possibility that the attack against the Twin Towers in New York City was *not so much* against America as against the Zionist-Jewish-American *collaboration*, given the (Zionist?) Jewish ownership of the towers, does not seem to have attracted the attention it deserves! What must our policy be?: (a) To destroy the rest of Near-and-Middle-East in order to save the Israelis there? Is this humane or at least wise? It is clear that we *cannot by any justification* exterminate the far more multitudinous rest of the Near-and-Middle-East! That would make an angel of Adolf Hitler! If before the war in Iraq the resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian strife was extremely difficult if not impossible, what will it be after the war, *brought about for the sake of Israel*, with all the new hatred added? And can we afford to make ourselves the target of terrorist attacks by Moslems and sympathizers and haters of America everywhere in the world for the sake of *such a policy*? (b) To declare Israel an other state of the USA and strike an offender *after* he has struck us there, thus getting permanently involved in Asian squabbles? This would put *us* in the present place of Israel! We must not forget that the greatest unconfessed fear of Israel has

to do with an *effective strike* against its own stockpiles of atomic-nuclear weapons *that are far too many and exposed to remain there*, and be they attacked they will render the entire area uninhabitable for an indefinitely long period of time! Has this danger been fully assessed? (c) To transfer all Israelis to the USA? Whatever the policy, *the Nation (and the rest of the world) must be fully informed, decide by referendum, and bite the bullet!* A great nation proves itself by the magnitude of the problems it solves for good as it leads the world ever higher! *That is* the test of *real* leadership!

The Americans *are* expected to die in defense of their country, should it be invaded. *Why* must they regard it strange, fanatical, improper or dishonorable that the Iraqis are not turned into traitors but defend their own country against an invader—even as he is us? Is it *passé* to recognize all honor due an opponent? *Is it honorable to fool (yet only) our own citizens and dishonor our own great history with half truths, lies and shameful propaganda*, when the enemy knows full well what we do to him? Or do we think the truth will not eventually be told? Where will we hide in shame then for dishonoring ourselves? Is it honorable or Christian to force the rest of the world into endorsing and participating not just in a major crime but in the above-mentioned blasphemy, or to intimidate mafia-style *even close friends into silence* for fear of meeting a similar fate? Whom do we associate with lately? Why must we copy, rather than learn from, the *foolish* Periclean Athenians whose deeds, drunken with raw power, *dishonored the grandeur of their words?* Look where they ended up, both then and now! I ask these questions even as I supported and defended this President during his election!

Mr. Ambassador, this describes my *spiritual* agony, that has forced me to lock myself at home for fear of being unable to answer these questions, **that I entrust to you alone, as the official representative of the Nation here!** Yet, we *must* answer these questions, even before the whole world, because this government of our Country has decided not just to meet a human challenge but to challenge directly God Himself on the matter of His own nature and goodness! So, before we all sink deeper into blasphemy carried by the false wings of hubris, please see to it that the Nation and its President are made aware of the full depth of the problem into which we have plunged, following *very badly mistaken* advice!

Best regards,

Re-edited slightly for this presentation.

AUTHOR'S COMMENT: The Ambassador never acknowledged receipt of this letter, and I know not whether he forwarded it to the President. Rumor, surfaced later, had it that Mr. Miller is of Jewish extraction.

Re: LETTER TO PROFESSOR SARRES

Κύριον Νεοκλήν Σαρρήν,
Καθηγητήν,
Ἀθήνας.

19 Ὀκτωβρίου 2003

Ἀγαπητὲ Κύριε Σαρρή:

Παρακολουθῶ μετὰ πολλοῦ ἐνδιαφέροντος τὰς ἀπὸ τηλεοράσεως ἐμφανίσεις ὑμῶν, καὶ ἰδιαιτέρως τὰς περὶ τῶν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας πραγμάτων. Φρονῶν δὲ περὶ τούτων ὅτι τὰ κάτωθι σημεῖα χρήζουσιν *ικανοποιητικῆς* ἐξηγήσεως, ἵνα μὴ ὁ λαὸς οὗτος *σκοπίμως ἀπαίδευτος* περὶ τὰ πνευματικὰ παρὰ τῶν *ύψηλὰ ἱσταμένων διατηρηθεῖς* ὅλως ἀποτυφλωθῇ, παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς ὅπως περιλάβετε ταῦτα ἐπειγόντως εἰς τὰς ἀμέσως ἐπομένους δημοσίας ὑμῶν ὁμιλίας!:

1. Ὡς "ἀρχιερεὺς" ἐστὶν ὁ πρῶτος τῶν ἱερέων, καὶ "ιεράρχης" ὁ τῶν ἱερῶν ἀρχων, σαφές ἐστὶν ὅτι *οὐ συνώνυμα* ταῦτα! Οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ὀφείλουσι *προστατεύειν*, *οὐκ ἐξουσιάζειν* τὰ ἱερά τοῦ Θεοῦ τε καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅτε δὲ τὸ ὕστερον μᾶλλον ἢ τὸ πρῶτον ποιοῦσιν, ὀφείλουσιν ἐπανέρχεσθαι εἰς τὴν τάξιν δι' αὐστηροῦ δημοσίου ἐλέγχου! Ἡ περὶ τὰ πνευματικὰ κρυφίότης *οὐκ* ἐστὶν ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ! Ὁ Χριστός, Οὗ οὗτοι λέγουσιν ἑαυτοὺς εἶναι διακόνους, *πάντα δημοσίως ἐδίδασκε, καὶ κρυφίως οὐδὲν εἶπεν!* ³ Ἄρα σοφώτεροι Κείνου εἰσὶν οὗτοι;

2. "Πατριάρχης" ἐστὶν ὁ πρῶτος τῶν πατέρων, οὗ τέκνα ἅπαν τ' ἀπ' αὐτοῦ γένος. Ἀλλ' ὑπάρχει *ρήτῃ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀπαγόρευσις*: "καὶ πατέρα μὴ καλέσητε ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, εἷς γάρ ἐστὶν ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν, ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς". Ἄρα, ὁ "πατριάρχης" Κων/πόλεως οὐ μόνον *αἰσχρῶς καὶ βλασφημῶς ἐπιχειρεῖ* *ἰδιοποιεῖσθαι ἰδιότητος ἧς οὐκ ἔχει* (τὴν κατὰ κόσμον πατρότητα τοῦ ἀπὸ βάθους ἱστορίας γηγενοῦς ἐν τῷδε τόπῳ γένους τῶν Ἑλλήνων, οὐδέποτε κατὰ τεκμήριον γεννήσας υἱόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν κατὰ πνεῦμα πατρότητα ᾧ μόνος ὁ ἐν οὐρανοῖς Κύριός ἐστι Πατήρ, ὅς μόνος αὐτοὺς αὐτῷ ἔδωκεν ἵνα δι' αὐτοὺς αἰὶ τὸν σὺν Χριστῷ Λόγον ἐν παντὶ ἀπαύστως ὀρθοτομῇ) κατὰ πλήρη περιφρόνησιν, ἄρα καὶ ὕβριν, Χριστοῦ, *ρήτῳ ἀπαγορεύσαντος* καὶ τοιούτους ἀπαιτεῖν καὶ τοιούτους ἀπονέμειν ἐπὶ γῆς τίτλους, *ἀκριβῶς ἵνα μή τις σκανδαλισθῇ ἢ σκανδαλίσῃ τὸν ἀδελφόν!* Κατανοεῖ τοῦτο *πρῶτος πάντων* ὁ ἑαυτὸν δηλῶν "πατριάρχην", ἢ *ἀνορθόδοξως καὶ ἀσιατικῶς* ἐμμενεῖ ἐπὶ τίτλων βλασφημῶν, δι' ᾧ ἀνοήτως ἡμεῖς οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἐξαντλοῦμεν τοὺς ὑπερθετικῶν ὑπερθετικούς, ὡς ἀκριβῶς γε ποιοῦμεν διὰ τῶν "θεοφιλέστατος" (ὡς ἂν γ' ἐγινώσκωμεν τίν' αὐτὸς ὁ Θεὸς τοιοῦτον ὀρίζει!), "σεβα-

σμιώτατος", "μακαριώτατος", "παναγιώτατος" καὶ "αὐτοῦ θειοτάτη παναγιότης"; Ὁ μὲν Κύριος ἠρώτησε "τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν, εἷς ἐστὶν ἀγαθός, ὁ ἐν οὐρανοῖς πάντων πατήρ", ἡμεῖς δὲ προσευχόμεθα λέγοντες "Πάτερ ἡμῶν..."· καὶ αὐτοὶ δι' ἑαυτοὺς τοιούτων τίτλων μόνον εἰς τὸν Θεὸν ἀνηκόντων θρασύτατα καὶ βλασφημώτατα καταχρῶνται! Πῶς οὖν οὗτοι Χριστιανοὶ Ὁρθόδοξοι, καὶ διδάσκαλοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων; Ἔστιν αἰδώς, ἢ μόνη θρασύτης; Ὑπὸ τὰς γενειάδας, ἐρυθρίᾳ τῆς αὐτῶν; Πῶς Ὁρθόδοξοι Χριστιανοὶ ἀνέχονται ταῦτα, ἢ ἔστι καὶ τοῦτο ὅλως κενὸν πλέον ὄνομα; Ἐπ' αἰῶνας ἤδη μακροῦς ἢ ἐν Βρεταννίᾳ Ἐκκλησία ἐχωρίσθη ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν Ῥώμῃ, ἀλλ' οἱ Βρεταννοὶ οὐδέποτε διενεοήθησαν ἀποκαλέσαι τινὰ "πατριάρχην", χριστιανικῶς ἱκανώτατον τὸ "ἀρχιεπίσκοπος" (ἡγουν, πρῶτος τῶν ἐπισκόπων) ὁρθῶς κρίναντες! Ἄλλ' αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσιν Ἀσιᾶται!

3. Ἐξεστί με καλεῖν ἑμαυτὸν ἐνεστώτα ἰδιοκτήτην *ἀνυπάρκτου* ἰδιοκτησίας; Πῶς οὖν ἄρ' αὐτοὶ ἀποκαλοῦσιν ἑαυτοὺς ἐνεστώτας "ιεράρχας" *ἀνυπάρκτων* ἐκκλησιῶν; Ἐκκλησίαι εἰσὶ ζώντων ζῶσαι πνευματικαὶ κοινωνίαι, οὐχὶ δὲ *κενοτάφια*, ἐν οἷς οἱ ἀναλόγου "πνευματικότητος" παλαιοὶ πρὸ αὐτοὺς "ιεράρχαι" *κατέθαψαν καὶ ἠφάνισαν* τὰς ὑπ' αὐτοὺς ἐκκλησίας! Αὐθις ἐρωτῶ: Ἔστιν αὐτοῖς γνωστὴ ἡ αἰδώς; Ἡ καὶ τὸν "πατριάρχην" πλέον κατέλαβεν ἡ γενικὴ τῆς κοινωνίας ἡμῶν πνευματικὴ σῆψις;

4. Οἱ πρῶτοι "πατριάρχαι" Κων/πόλεως ἀπήτησαν δι' ἑαυτοὺς τὸν πρῶτον λόγον ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐν τῇ τότε *μιᾷ* Ἐκκλησίᾳ *μόνον* διὰ τὸ εἶναι τὴν ἐν Κων/πόλει τοιαύτην τὴν *πολυπληθεστάτην* πασῶν τῶν τοπικῶν ἐκκλησιῶν! Ἀντιλαμβανόμεθα πάντες τί ἡ ἀπαίτησις ἐκείνη ὑπονοεῖ; Ἡ μεταξὺ Παλαιᾶς καὶ Νέας Ῥώμης ῥήξις τελικῶς διὰ τὴν ἀπαίτησιν ἐκείνην ἐπῆλθεν! Οἱ τῆς Νέας Ῥώμης, *ὄντες τὰ παράγωγα προϊόντα κείνης τῆς ῥήξεως*, νῦν *ἀρνοῦνται* τὴν *ὁμοίαν*, αὐτοῖς πλέον δέουσαν, *ὑποχώρησιν* διὰ τὸ παρὸν *πολυπληθέστερον* ἄλλων ἐκκλησιῶν, ὥς οἱ προκάτοχοι αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀπήτουν! Εἰ νῦν ὁ "πατριάρχης" ἐστὶν ἐν δικαίῳ, *ἐν ἀδίκῳ τότ' ἦσαν οἱ ἐν Κων/πόλει*! Ἀντιλαμβάνονται τοῦθ' οἱ νῦν ἐν Κων/πόλει; Πῶς οἱ "ιεροὶ κανόνες", *οὓς οἱ προκάτοχοι τούτων ἐθέσπισαν*, μονίμως ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν μόνων δεῖτ' ἐρμηνεύεσθαι, κούχῃ ἐν Πνεύματι Κυρίου ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχόντων τὴν εὐλογίαν τῆς "πολυπληθεστότητος"; Κατὰ τὸ τότε μέτρον (ὅπερ ἂν ἀγνοηθῇ *ῥῆξιν* δημιουργήσῃ τῆς ἥς ἐπικαλοῦνται "Ἱερᾶς Παραδόσεως"), μεταξὺ μὲν τῶν Ἑλλήνων Ὁρθόδοξων Χριστιανῶν ὁ πρῶτος λόγος νῦν ἀνήκει τῷ ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐπισκόπῳ, μεταξὺ δὲ πάντων τῶν Ὁρθόδοξων Χριστιανῶν τῷ ἐν Μόσχᾳ! Οἱ βαρὺ τοῦτο εὐρίσκοντες παραπονείσθωσαν τῷ Κυρίῳ! Τὰ λοιπὰ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ! Ἡ διαμάχη ἐστὶ *καταδήλως* *περὶ τὰ πρωτεῖα καὶ τὰ ἐξ αὐτῶν πλοῦτη καὶ ἐξουσίας*, ἅτινα οἱ ἐν Κων/πόλει ἐμπραγμάτως ἀπώλυντο, διὰ τὴν παλαιὰν αὐτῶν καὶ ἔτι διαρκοῦσαν περὶ τὰ πνευματικὰ ἀνικανότητα, *προσκολλώμεν' ἠθελημένως* ἐν τόπῳ δουλείας καὶ ὁμηρείας καὶ τύποις νεκροῖς, *ἐνθεν ἀδύνατον* τὸρθοτομεῖν Λόγον Χριστοῦ, διαρρήδην ἀπορρίπτοντες τὴν ἰδέαν τῆς μετοικεσίας εἰς τόπον ἐλευθερίας, *ἐνθεν αὐθις* διαλάμψει δι' αὐτῶν ὁ Λόγος Χριστοῦ! Ἄραγ' ἔμεινεν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ πίστις τις;; Οὐκ ἐπιθυμοῦσι μετοικεῖν εἰς Ἀθήνας; Οὐ ψεκτέον! Μετοικησάτωσαν εἰς Ἅγιον Ὄρος, ἢ ἔτι κάλλιον εἰς Washington, D.C., ἔνθα νῦν

καὶ ἡ ἔδρα τῆς ἰσχύος καὶ συνταγματικῶς κατωχυρωμένη ἐστὶν ἡ πλήρης τοῦ θρησκεύειν ἐλευθερία ὡς οὐδέποτε· αὐτοὶ ἔγνωσαν, ὅθεν ὁ Λόγος Χριστοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσι κάλλιον κηρυχθήσεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις! Τοῖς πιστεύουσι τῷ Θεῷ, οὐδέν ἐστιν ἀδύνατον! Ἀλλὰ πιστεύουσι νῦν εἰς Θεὸν οἱ περὶ τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὰ ἦθη καὶ ἔθιμ' αὐτῆς νομομαθεῖς, "ιεράρχαι" καὶ καθηγηταί; Διατί οὖν ἄρ' οὐδεμίαν οὗτοι ἀναφορὰν ποιοῦσιν εἰς τὸν Χριστόν;

5. Ἀεὶ δεῖ τοὺς Χριστιανοὺς ἀληθεύειν! Πῶς οὖν ἀληθεύει ὁ λόγος περὶ "Μητρὸς Ἐκκλησίας"; Αἱ ἐν Ἑλλάδι Ἐκκλησίαι Χριστοῦ ἀπὸ Φιλίππων ἕως Κορίνθου, ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἀπ. Παύλου τρεῖς αἰῶνας πρὸ τῆς ἐν Κων/πόλει ἐγκαταστάσεως καθιδρύθησαν! Ὅτι ἡ Κων/πολις ὕστερον ἐμονοπωλῶσε πᾶσαν δραστηριότητα οὐ πρὸς ἔπαινον ἀλλὰ ψόγον, ὅτι οὕτως ἐγκατελείφθη ἡ αὐτοκρατορία καὶ τέλει ὡς καὶ ἡ Πόλις ἐάλω! Εἰ δὲ περὶ δογμάτων ὁ λόγος, ἡ Ὁρθοδοξία οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀποκλειστικότης τῆς Κων/πόλεως, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἡνωμένης τότε Ἐκκλησίας! Μὴ δὲ λησμονῶμεν ὅτι αἱ πλείσται κακοδοξίαι ἐν Κων/πόλει ἐνεφανίσθησαν! Εἰ δὲ περὶ γλώσσης καὶ "κρυφοῦ σχολείου" ὁ λόγος, εἰπάτωσαν ἡμῖν ἀληθῶς εἰ περὶ τῆς παιδείας Ἑλλήνων ὁ μόχθος ἐκεῖνος (ὅτε ἡ περὶ παιδείας φροντίς ἐν Βυζαντίῳ καὶ Ὀθωμανικῇ Τουρκοκρατίᾳ ἰδιωτικῇ τῶν δυναμένων φέρειν τὴν περὶ ταύτης δαπάνην ἦν καὶ παρέμεινε, περιοριζομένη εἰς τὰς δοκουμένας ἀνάγκας τῆς οἰκογενείας, τοῦ κράτους καὶ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, οὐχὶ γενικὴ τε καὶ δημοσία καθ' ὅλην τὴν ἐπικράτειαν ὡς ἡμεῖς νῦν ταύτην γινώσκουμεν), ἢ διὰ μόνην αὐτὴν γε τὴν ὑπαρξίν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, δοθείσης τῆς ἀδερῆτον ἀνάγκης ἀναγνώσεως ἔστω, ἄφες κατανοήσεως, παρ' ἱερέων τε καὶ ψαλτῶν τῶν ἐν τῇ Θ. Λειτουργίᾳ ἀναγκαίων κειμένων! Ἡ διατήρησις τῆς παιδείας τῶν ἐκτὸς τῆς Ὀθωμ. Αυτοκρατορίας παροικίων τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἦν καθαρὰ κείνων ὑπόθεσις, ἀνευ τινὸς συνδρομῆς τοῦ "πατριαρχείου"! Οὐχὶ διὰ τοῦ μόχθου τῶν ἐπ' Ἐκκλησίᾳ "ιεραρχῶν" ἡ παιδεία Ἑλλήνων διετηρήθη καὶ ἐπλατύνθη! Τὸ ὄντως μέγα πρὸ τῶν ἐπ' ἀνατολῇ μονίμως ὀμφαλοσκοποουσῶν δῆθεν "Ὁρθοδόξων" Χριστιανικῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν κατὰ τὸν μεσαῖωνα ἔργον, ὅπερ ἦν ἡ ἐκχριστάνισις τῆς Ἀσίας, οὐδέποτε παρ' αὐτῶν ἀνελήφθη, καὶ νῦν παγκοσμίως ἀπολαμβάνομεν τὰς ὀδυνηροτάτας φεῦ συνεπείας ἐκείνης τῆς ἀδρανείας! Πανσάτω οὖν ἐπὶ τέλους ἡ θρασεῖα προσπάθεια ἰδιοποιήσεως κενῶν τίτλων τιμῆς, ὅτι οὐ μακρὰν αἰρέσεως εὐρίσκεται τὸ "πατριαρχεῖον" διὰ τὴν ὡς δῆθεν "Μητρὸς" ἀπαίτησιν σεβασμοῦ καὶ ὑποταγῆς εἰς τὴν ἐξουσίαν αὐτοῦ πολυπληθεστέρων ζωσῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν, οὐ δὲ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὸν μάλιστα πρόσθετον λόγον τῆς "πατριαρχικῆς λογίας", ἥτις τελικῶς ἀποβαίνει εἰς τὸ μάλα μείζον ὄφελος τοῦ τουρκικοῦ κράτους ἐν ᾧ αὐτὴ ὡς σκληρὸν νόμισμα δαπανᾶται, ἐπὶ ζημίᾳ τοῦ ὅπου γῆς ἑλληνικοῦ ἔθνους τοῦ καὶ καταβάλλοντος ἡλιθίως τὰ οὐδέποτε ἐξαντλούμενα λύτρα τῆς πεισματικῶς ἡθελημένης δουλείας καὶ ὁμηρείας τῶν οὕτως ὅπου γῆς ἀλυτρώτων!

6. Λέγεται ὅτι ἡ Ὁρθόδοξος Ἐκκλησία ὀργανισμός ἐστι δημοκρατικός! Ἀληθές; Τί ἐστὶν Ἐκκλησία; Ἔστιν ὁ πιστὸς λαὸς Θεοῦ Ἐκκλησία; Διατί οὖν ἄρ' οὐδέποτε ὁ λαὸς ἐρωτᾶται παρὰ τῶν κατὰ μόνην ἐπίφασιν δῆθεν ἀρχηγῶν αὐτῆς; Τί; Ἀμόρφωτος περὶ τὰ πνευματικά ἐστὶν ὁ λαός; Τίνες ἀμόρφωτον αὐτὸν ἐγκατέλιπον, εἰ μὴ μόνοι οἱ διὰ τῆς αὐτῶν περιφρονήσεως

τούτου οὕτω λοιδοροῦντες αὐτόν, οἱ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἀπαιτοῦντες ὑποταγὴν ὡς προβάτων, χειροφίλημα *παρὰ* τὴν Χριστοῦ ἀπαγόρευσιν, καὶ "λογίας"; Ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ Χριστοῦ ὁ πρῶτος λόγος ἀνήκει εἰς τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν πιστῶν ἐν οἷς κατοικεῖ τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, οὐχὶ εἰς τοὺς κατὰ μόνον ἐπάγγελμα πλέον ἐπὶ κεφαλῇς αὐτῆς "ιεράρχας"! Ἄρα οἱ "ιεράρχαι" ὀφείλουσι πλήρη ἀναφορὰν πεπραγμένων παντὶ τῷ Ἐκκλησίας πληρώματι, οὐχὶ δὲ μόνῳ τῷ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ ἢ "πατριάρχῃ"! Κατανοοῦμεν οἱ πάντες;

7. Ὁ "πατριάρχης" δέχεται τὸν Ἀθηνῶν ὡς καὶ "πάσης Ἑλλάδος" ἀρχιεπίσκοπον. Ἐρεῖ ἡμῖν *καθαρὰ τῇ φωνῇ* ἕως ποῦ ἐννοεῖ τὴν "πᾶσαν Ἑλλάδα", καὶ *πῶς* ἐννοεῖ τὸ τῆς ἐν Ἑλλάδι Ἐκκλησίας Χριστοῦ αὐτοκέφαλον; Ὁ Κύριος εἶπεν: "ὅπου δύο ἢ τρεῖς ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ ὀνόματι, ἐκεῖ καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν". Ἡμεῖς, ὅσοι πιστοί, προσπαθοῦμεν παραμένειν ὡς ἡ ἐν Ἑλλάδι τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησία! *Οὐχὶ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἢ τῆς Κων/πόλεως!* Ἀλλὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ! Ἀντιλαμβάνεται ποσῶς ὁ κ. Βαρθολομαῖος *ποῦ* ἐπιχειρεῖ εἰσχωρεῖν, *τίνα* ἐπιδιώκει ὑποκαταστήσειν;

8. Λυπηρότατα ταῦτα! Παύσουσί ποτε οἱ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας δῆθεν σπουδαῖοι φροντίζειν περὶ μόνης τῆς δόξης αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, καὶ τῶν ἀργυρίων ὡς οἱ τοῦ ποτε Ναοῦ ἀργυραμοιβοί; Ὁρθοτομήσουσί ποτε τὸν *Λόγον Κυρίου* κατὰ τὰς ἐκάστοτε *παρούσας* πνευματικὰς *πάντων* τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀνάγκας, οὐχὶ δὲ τὰπὸ τοῦ μεσαίωρος καὶ τουρκοκρατίας ἀγαπητὰ αὐτοῖς ἀμαθῇ, ἡμιμαθῇ, μειξευσεβῇ τετριμμένα καὶ ψεῦδη;

Προσηκόντως κατὰ Χριστόν,

AUTHOR'S COMMENT: Ὁ Καθηγητής, μετὰ τὴν λήψιν τῆς παρούσης, ἠρκέσθη ἀπλῶς εἰς τἀναγνώσαι δημοσίως *μόνην τὴν ὑστάτην ταύτης παράγραφον*, καὶ καθὼς δ' ἐγὼ γε γινώσκω οὐδέποτε (καθότι καὶ εἰς *οὐδεμίαν περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ποτ' ἦλθε μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐπαφήν*) ἔδρασε δημοσίως εἰς παιδευσιν τοῦ λαοῦ κατὰ τὰς *ἀναντιρρήτους* ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ Ἀληθείας, ἀλλὰ κατατρίβεται δημοσίως ἐπὶ θεμάτων παντελῶς συγκριτικῶς ἀσημάντων! Ἄρ' οὐ τολμᾷ θίξαι τὴν ἱστορικὴν ρίζαν (πρόσωπά τε καὶ καταστάσεις) τῶν παντελῶς ἀπνευματίστων παγκοσμίως νῦν γιγνομένων ὑπ' αὐτὰ γε τὰ ὄμματα τῶν ὁμοίως ἐκείνοις ἔτι καὶ νῦν δρώντων ἀφ' ὑψηλῶν, ἀλλ' *ἀρνούμενων* πεισμόνως διὰ τὴν *κρυφίαν αὐτῶν ἀπιστίαν* Θεῷ συνετίσαι διὰ *συγχρόνου καθαροῦ Λόγου* ἄφρονα πρόσωπα, "ἡγέτας", ἕως καὶ λαοὺς ὅλους, οὕτω διὰ πάντων ἐκείνων ὁδηγουμένων ἐπὶ κρημνόν!

Re: LETTER TO DR. GEORGE BISTIS

Professor George N. Bistis
64 Kline Boulevard
Berkeley Heights, NJ. 07922

December 20/21, 2004.

On the present state of Science

Dear George:

It was good of you to send me your note. An opportunity for me to unload! I, sorrowfully, learned that with your leg problems your traveling days come to a close. I do very much hope I got it all wrong!

Before I even opened the envelope, I almost knew what it would be about! The True Greeks of old used to say “ἐκ περισσείας καρδίας ἡ γλῶσσα ὁμιλεῖ”, meaning “from what’s in excess in the heart does the tongue speak”—and the pen scribble! To which in these cunning times we must indeed add also: “and according to its cunning does it leave unsaid what must at last be clearly said”! When at the end of 2004 you send me a more-than-five-years-old, and so, *stale* pseudoscientific paper, by a Nobel laureate no less, this is indeed proof self-evident that *nothing worth mentioning* has indeed been added since! So, to say that even Nobel laureates have yet to learn how to think correctly isn’t exactly an insult, is it, when they and others tell us that science advances with ever greater speed and strides!:

Let us assume that Weinberg is right, and God does not exist. Where does that leave us? As we come ever closer to it, we must indeed contemplate deeply that horrible “earth to earth” from the so-called “Holy Bible” of the Jews, one hears before one is sent six feet under: But with God not being there, “earth” has other connotations too, that must also be considered: For it also means “soil”, “dirt”, “filth”; and “vermin”, and (let’s not be squeamish, *not* impolite) “excrement”, and (indeed, animal and human) “feces”! Doesn’t *all* that get mixed up together? If there is no God do we not indeed spring up solely from *that* soil—of the outhouse and of the grave? When for our extreme sensitivities we blunt so much our *reasonable* sensibilities, we leave out of our “scientific” consciousness all the malefic odor of our own “philosophy”! Weinberg *consciously*

chooses to be of just that origin! Either this, or he *cannot* be as intelligent as the Nobel prize he so proudly carries advertises him to be! In order to spite the God of his own fathers, *he consciously, with all the weight of the prize, chooses to make them and himself one and the same with all the above—his own feces especially!* Please note: I do *not* malign him! I only attempt to draw *all the proper and inescapable* conclusions from his own proposition!

And what's one to say about his final insistence? Presented with the mere *possibility* of an extraordinarily good fortune and coldbloodedness, that as a mortal he too must consider as a possible counterweight against his claim of happiness, he instead mixes up Yeats and Shakespeare in defense of *his* right to feel not just happy but *gaily* happy with just this his *own* tragic condition—with “the great stage curtain about to drop”! That instead of *his* right he so “politely” uses the “our right” only makes matters worse: He, with *complete Jewish impoliteness and disdain*, throws at us all the “vermin thou art and to vermin shalt thou return, all of you utter fools that you honored me even with the Nobel prize, that with its cash value and all added material benefits made me so much more gaily ‘happier’!” A Godless world must still be brave enough to empty the bitter cup of its own choice, down to the last dregs! But that is only for the fools! For those up there like himself, only “remarkable happiness”! What he totally fails to understand is that *only religion provides the least common ground of a universal ethics!* That without religion, we only have the *whimsical* “law” of the strongest, that is to say *no law at all!* He, drunk with his own importance, does not see that without *that* least ground, against which he pours all his vitriol, he joins forces even with Hitler and *all* criminals up and down that ladder, and has thus forfeited the right to be indignant at anything immoral! Nor does he see his obligation, after having demolished the foundation of religion, to provide *his* version of morality based on physics, or more strictly on quantum mechanics, and the “final theory of everything” he and his likes are so hard at work to *invent!* Of course Solon spoke of the riskiness of human life—but isn't that always, and especially today, contingent on the whims of *others*, acting without a universal morality based on the least common holiness? We *do* need better, more introspect, professors up there!

As for the star-based probabilities Weinberg mentions, this: Up to about ten years ago, I, too, thought it possible to build a strong argument on broadly similar grounds, though in the opposite direction. Then I realized that just as engineers don't start building except with bricks, so too, the universe is *not* built of stars, but of *material quanta, the fundamental particles!* I fear it is grossly churlish for a quantum mechanician to ignore this truth and find it enough to “[s]uppose that calculations showed that the chance of any single planet having a surface gravity, temperature and chemical composition favorable for the appearance of life, and of life actually arising on this planet, and of this life becoming intelligent through natural selec-

tion, is no greater than one part in, say, a million million” [how dare he *suppose* such odds without *solid* physico-mathematical arguments?], and then see that that last number is nothing compared to the vast number of “at least a hundred billion billion stars in the universe (perhaps an infinite number)”, the majority of which (as *conjectured on small evidence*!) have planets, in order “not to be surprised that chance events governed by impersonal natural laws have produced intelligent life on at least one of the planets”, because then, “[w]ith these odds, it would be surprising if intelligent life had not appeared” totally by chance! In the first place, the *totally unsupported* statement of an infinite grand universe is made just as a throw-back in case the calculation of probabilities from the known universe turns out to be unfavorable! An audience inclined to be impressed by the mere fact that a Nobel laureate condescends to offer them a public lecture simply do not have the time immediately to digest all they so greedily swallow, that is thrown to them “so graciously”! But Hard Science is only made on Hard Facts! The “‘chaotic inflation’ theories of André Linde and others” on which the notion of a grand infinite “universe of universes” is based is *not* Hard Science but *mere speculation* proposed *solely* in order to baffle the opponents and extricate the likes of Weinberg from the jaws of desperation! By my reasoning (and I do *not* seem to be alone, for I have seen a *similar number mentioned* in some book that at the time, with other things in mind, I made no note of, and on my next several visits to the Physics Dept. library at Rutgers had, alas, been taken out!), in *our* universe of roughly 10^{56} g, there are $N = 5.89 \times 10^{120} = 10^{120.7701\dots}$ fundamental particles. In the absence of God, these particles *do stand out as Gods, each one of them in its unshakable Godly state*! First question for a quantum mechanician that is a non-believer in a *Creator God*: What is the probability that *all* those particles be of *exactly the same* nature? For obviously, *this is the ground state question upon which alone* may we begin to make probabilistic calculations! For, otherwise, this our universe would be subject to *no* law at all! Particles of dissimilar nature simply do *not* get governed by the same law(s)! Without getting into more details of the argument here, let me give you the

$$\text{Answer: } p_{\phi,N} = (10^{-120.7701\dots})^{10^{120.7701\dots}} = 10^{-10^{122.8520\dots}}!$$

Second question to our same friend: What is the probability that all those particles be of the “*same mind-and-will*”, as it were, when in fact they have no mind, in order to “agree” to behave as *if subject even to a single law* when in fact there is no law at all, solely in order to give us, fools that we are, the *appearance* of law in the absence of it? For, otherwise, I do not see how God-like particles can agree to behave identically; because a common nature simply does *not* guarantee a common behavior! To assume the opposite already assumes much too much! An *automatic* behavior based on common nature is *not* to be expected of a God-like state! Again leaving other details out:

$$\text{Answer: } p_{\beta,N} = 10^{-10^{122.8520\dots}}$$

For a universe to end up behaving as does ours, each particle must possess *not any but the “best” or “most appropriate”* nature, and not any but the “best” or “most appropriate” will, suitable to its (though “unwilled”) “purposes”. The probability of it happening is

$$p_{\phi,\beta} = (10^{-120.7701\dots}) \times (10^{-120.7701\dots}) = (10^{-241.5402\dots}).$$

So the probability that *all* fundamental particles be of the *same* best or most appropriate nature and possess the *same* best or most appropriate will is

$$p_{\phi,\beta,N} = (10^{-241.5402\dots})^{10^{120.7701\dots}} = (10^{-10^{123.1530\dots}}).$$

This is the *ground* probability upon which the probabilities of all *independent* laws that are then required for building the universe as we know it must be based; namely, if the probabilities of all the successive laws are 10^{-w} , 10^{-x} , 10^{-y} , 10^{-z} , etc. then it is by the product of all these fractions that the above value of $p_{\phi,\beta,N}$ must be multiplied. The total probability of this our universe behaving as it does *cannot* be better than

$$p_{\text{total}} = (10^{-10^{123.1530\dots}}) \times 10^{-w} \times 10^{-x} \times 10^{-y} \times 10^{-z} \dots$$

Would any one of our illustrious Nobel laureates care to list *all* fundamental laws required, *one by one*, and the *total* number of *possible* laws in *each* group, out of which *each one of the required fundamental laws* was picked, solely by chance in the *total* absence of an intelligent picker, in order for our universe to behave as we observe down to all its stupendous details, including the living scale from the amoeba to man? I just said “the total probability of this our universe behaving as it does *cannot* be better than”, and *is* in fact a *round zero* because, the moment it is shown that the universe does have a beginning, as is proven *sufficiently by a non-infinite present age for it appearing in the laws*, the fundamental particles *cannot* claim past everlastingness; without which they *cannot* claim an existence independent of a Creator! The moment this universe is shown to have a zero probability to stand on its own, down, of course, go *both all* speculation even of an infinite universe beyond the limits of this one, *and the entire* antitheistic movement, along with the Nobel prizes that purport to support it! The Good Lord has in fact saved us from having to list all those laws: He reveals right from the start to all who have a mind really to read what they read, as I did at the start of this effort, that the universe does depend on a *law of expansion (coming inseparably together with Newton’s law of gravitation) dependent on its finite, not infinite, present age!* The balance of the argument came only later, to prove the entire proposition Logically unshakable! This is why the antitheists hide! And this is why they suppress the news of it! And this is why they speak before *secure* audiences! The rest is Judgment!

So, George, please don't be naïve and say they don't know of my proof: Since 1985 I have told enough people all the way up to the Nobel prize level! That they do not hearken is only proof of their *malevolent conscious determination* to avoid consideration of the complete consequences of their own teachings! They screen ever so carefully all who shall be allowed to retain a public voice, so that the blasphemy may reach its colophon! The "science" "we" (that is, *they*) make is *not* the *Science* we find operating out there, but the "science" we (*they*) *consciously invent* to support our (*their*) at least two-thousand-year-old rejection of the offer made to them to be lifted up from the state of soil to the state of Spirit! If Christ had offered them what they asked Him of, every last Jew *would have become* a Christian! That's how they understood religion, both then and now! If it does not come that way, the Jews will have nothing to do with it! Christ asked them to stop feeling as vermin, and to begin feeling as ἀνθρώποι —but that is a *pure Greek idea, as is the Spirit*! Semites will have none of it! Look at what happens today down there!: For two thousand years, instead of returning to Palestine, they chose to live among the Christians!: Why? In order to present to them, from within their common daily lives, *that* counter-argument to the idea that God does indeed exist and became (hu)Man in order to elevate (hu)men to Heaven. The Europeans felt the point deeply! But alas, they too got poisoned! The rest is History! And the Jews emigrated to America! Under cover of the Constitution, they practice their own *well-hidden* version of religion: Weinberg "admit(s) that, even when physicists will have gone as far as they can go, when we have a final theory, we will not have a completely satisfying picture of the world, because we will still be left with the question 'why?'" But that does *not* make him a *concerned skeptic*, not even an *indifferent agnostic*! *No!* He *chooses to be openly polemical* against God! But that *is religion*! By *definition*! Religion is *not the belief* in God, but the *definite taking of a stand, any stand*, on the matter pertaining to Him! It is a very sad fact that the American Way has been so naïve on these matters as to allow America to fall prey to the polemical antitheism of the Jews she imported! The Constitution does *not* allow making politics of Religion, does *not* allow making politics of polemical antitheism, does *not* allow going beyond *concerned skepticism at the outmost*! For the *faulty* American reading of the Scriptures, today Americans have sided with King Herod of Judea who massacred the infants to save his throne! *That* preemptive-strike "philosophy" is today promulgated as hallowed State Policy! America, lured by the promise of untold profit, attacked Iraq in order to cover up what Israel is doing in Palestine!: Together, *they both* strike preemptively, and one *cannot* accuse Israel before accusing the greater offender: America! Ergo: America, and the world, *deserve better* Nobel laureates! The blood shed in Iraq is *not* that of the children of the people making a rich living out of the speculations at the stock markets of the world! Those people have no country other than their profits! The blood

shed belongs to people who believe, rightly or wrongly, but *believe*! In *values*, *not* paper or plastic money! We should want to know how many, American Jews and others, sharing Weinberg's *religious* antitheistic beliefs, have *volunteered* to fight for *Good*, *not for profit* in Iraq! Is this the way *Good* is fought for? Do they at all know what *Good* is, that belongs to a level *infinitely above* their own, when they, preoccupied with the filth in which they swim and breathe, simply do not have the time and heart to lift up their heads?

Only yesterday I read that in China, people are converting to Christianity by the millions, and churches of capacities up to four thousand people are being built there! It seems clear that in the end, the Jews and their allies will be the last active antitheists left! But alas! As the Christians *don't* believe enough in the absolute supremacy of Logos-Reason, that is none other than God Almighty, all those billions of believers will be led by the nose, by the tiny minority of Jewish active antitheists and their minions! Alas! The End draws ever closer, but *not* forced by the good deeds of Christians, but by the evil ones of those sworn to remain against Christ for not making them since then the masters of the world! In the end, they indeed *will* become the masters—though only of their own world of *ashes and feces*, in which alone they believe! The blasphemy grows, by leaps and bounds, dressed in the finest “communicatese”! But it takes some courage to penetrate that language barrier! May the End come soon, or else we all shall speak that final language of blasphemy, unbeknownst of what we truly are saying; believing ourselves to be the Chosen People! The Jews produced the idea of the Chosen People—of oriental traders bargaining with God! Too good an idea to leave it, unexploited by “us”, to the Jews! So the Christians took it up too, as did the Moslems! The latter, *unaltered* straight out of the Old Testament itself! What we seem to be missing is that *all* the Bibles are written by *us*, in *our* languages and in *our* words, according to *our* hearts—which is why we find in them only what fits us best! *So* is it that we burden *our One common* God with our abyssal divers hatreds. In the market places of Western Asia, hatreds run very deep, along with the waters of the deserts out of which the traders drink! What bemuses me is why the Americans did not avoid getting there, where they can only be pelted from all sides!

Sad thoughts on our sad world, struggling to be “lit” by glow-worms swimming in the filth! With so much destruction, bloodletting, maiming and death, it seems a definite blasphemy to wish merriness rather than introspection and contrition to Christmas revelers! May the Lord take pity on us for what we wrought against the Divine Order! And what joy may still come to our hearts, may it be from the Logical certainty that that Order, coming solely from Logos, not from Anarchy, rules Supreme in the Firmament and the Heavens above, even as it does not on this pitiful globe!

Best wishes to you all, for Christmas and the New Year,

Re: LETTER TO DR. GEORGE BISTIS

Professor George N. Bistis
64 Kline Boulevard
Berkeley Heights, NJ. 07922

May 12/17, 2005.

A second look at the present state of Science

Dear George:

Be well! Helen was good enough to bring us some news of you!

Nothing is perfect that is done in haste! Most writings *are* better when they are left to simmer and mature—at least for some days! I wanted to answer your last note in time for you to have something to mull over during Christmas, so I ended the probabilistic part of my letter of Dec. 20/21, 2004 by citing p_{total} . I realized the incompleteness of that my discussion a few days later, and I have since meant to correct it, but other occupations have till now prevented me from doing so.

For, in fact, the argument goes far deeper: That probability refers *only to the sum of forever stable* laws ruling over *our* universe, that is *only one in a forever changeable (and according to its conceivers) infinite “universe of universes”*! If they devised that concept in order to conceal (yet only from the eyes of idiots!) under it *their* ultimate escape from responsibility, *we are not released from ours demanding a detailed investigation of that larger whole*! When Nietzsche spoke of the death of God and the birth of Superman, *he did not mean to demolish all responsibility, but to transfer it whole from the former to the latter*!: “If you want to abolish God, then *each of you must* behave as God!” *All else* is nihilism! Of which, not even a trace is to be found in the idea of Superman! So truly, *if* we dismiss God, *we* become the thinkers in His stead, and *we must consider all questions* pertaining to Reality! That Nobel prize winners prefer to be nihilistic, even without saying it clearly, only betrays the depths of evil out of which their genus sprang up! Indeed, *what is* the meaning of searching for the equation that answers all questions *if all is a heap of trash*? And would it not be more reasonable, that is *if* there is some sense still left in them, to start their search by studying a *small*, their own at home heap of trash, and *only afterwards* extend their “reasoning” to larger scales, than by jumping from

the start to the *supposed escape* of the “universe of universes”? In human language “universe” means *uni-verse*, i.e., *a perfectly organized whole in which nothing is out of order!* Accordingly, a “universe of universes” means expanding *that* order, rather than the trash in their souls, ad infinitum! Ignoring this inescapable fact, they fail to realize that they get trapped ever worse in their own snares as they try to escape from responsibility: Expanding Reality to include that forever changeable “universe of universes” *expands correspondingly the sum of questions demanding answers*, and *no* question that seeks to detail the circumstances of that larger whole is fickle, trite, or trivial!

So, on to the task: In a forever changeable universe of universes, *how does any particular law remain forever constant?* This is *not* the same question as the question of how the law is picked from the entire lot of laws potentially applicable to the same domain of real facts. Rather, it has to do with what looks like but is *not* the “quantization” of time!: When “*all is change*”, even the laws are *not* excluded! So, we seek the *longest* interval of time within which the *set of cards of all potentially applicable laws* are reshuffled and recast and the *same law is picked up every time*, under which unique circumstance the *mere appearance* of law stability is given to *all* onlookers, even when in fact there is none such! The *only* interval of time that comes to mind is the so-called “Planck time” of about 10^{-44} sec. duration. In 12 billion years (age of our universe) there are some $3.787 \times 10^{60} = 10^{61.5783...}$ such intervals; and therefore, there must have so far been *an equal number of times in succession during each one of which the same law was picked out of the perfectly mixed set!* This means that there is a revised probability

$$P_{t,T} = (P_{\text{total}})^{10^{61.5783...}},$$

where p_{total} is that of my previous letter [here on p. 563] that is *further reduced* by being raised to the $10^{61.5783...}$ power! And we are *not* yet done!

For seek we must the probability of finding an *unbroken volume in space* of just the size to contain the number of *all adjacent cubicles* comprising the cube just containing the sphere of *this our* [*incessantly expanding—but leave this for later*] *universe*, in which *all that happens just happens by mere chance*, which *unbroken volume in space* is only a tiny fraction of the entire volume of the “universe of universes”! Well, even I have my limits! And here, I find I come pretty close to them, for I do not quite know how to begin *collecting mathematically together and setting in such perfect adjacent geometrical form all cubicles of space* in which *all the above (including all I said in my previous letter) just happens as it pertains to each such cubicle!* For it is quite clear that, a cubicle of space, filled with all there is in it, perfectly fitted in a particular spot on a particular petal of a particular rose belonging in a rosebush of your own garden is *not* perfectly fitted anywhere in the sun, nor in the interstellar void, nor indeed anywhere else except in *exactly the spot where it truly belongs on the particular*

petal of the particular rose in your garden! Now, suppose there are just five places, each one of them unique, awaiting to be filled by five cubes, each one also unique, allowable only in its own unique place. Thrown up in the air, all five cubes *must land, each one into its own right place, perfectly oriented and perfectly fitted!* As there is only an $1/6$ chance that a cube may come right face up, if further you are satisfied that an one degree of angle deviation from proper orientation suffices to cause failure, then already the chance of proper space orientation of each cubicle is only $(1/6) \times (1/360)$, and each has only an $1/5$ chance of getting at its own right place. The chance of the entire ensemble to come up perfectly thus is $[(1/6) \times (1/360) \times (1/5)]^5$. Now in the real world, if you accept as meaningful the “Planck length” of 10^{-33} cm, there presently are some $(17 \times 10^{27} / 10^{-33})^3 = 10^{183.6913...}$ such cubicles in the cube containing the *present* sphere of this universe. You get an idea of what is further involved in a “universe of universes” by considering that a space filled with a thousand universes is *only* ten universes deep in each direction, while a space filled with a billion universes is *only* one thousand universes deep in each direction! As this last number *just about begins* to make some sense of a “universe of universes”, the cube containing a billion universes of equal size contains at *least* (that is, *if* there is no void separating the universes from each other) $10^{192.691347}$ Planck cubicles, *that must all be filled perfectly!* It follows that the probability that all these cubicles fall correctly *each in its own right place during each Planck timicle* is

$$(1/6) \times (1/360) \times (1/10^{192.691347})^{10^{192.691347}} = 10^{-10^{194.98367}},$$

which *must multiply* the $p_{t,T}$ for all that can happen by chance in *only* 12 b. y.!

And if you insist, as they do, “but there has been an infinite past time in which all this did have ample time to be tried”, you miss the entire point: When all is flux, *nothing can freeze for ever on after a particular combination has been gotten!* When all is flux, if *all* observers are to be fouled into believing that stability exists, *all* must be recast *by mere constant redrawing out of a perfect mix of the one “lucky” combination*, yet so fast that this very process of constant redrawing remain physically undetectable! On top of which, you must *also* consider that in an “infinite universe of universes”, the above huge power takes the form of $[(1/6) \times (1/360) \times (1/\infty)]^\infty$ which in effect *denies* you the “advantage” of an infinite past age as the probability of a particular combination becomes *worse than* $\infty^{-\infty}$! [exclamation, *not* factorial!]. Which in simple words means that *it is vastly more likely that a small population of things come to perfect order by chance than can do so a vast population!* (But don’t even teenagers know this? How then does it escape Nobel laureates?) Our universe *is both*: large enough to show stupendously small the probability of things having come to order by mere chance within its lifetime, *and* small enough to show how vastly more preferable *it* is even from the probabilistic viewpoint than an “infinite universe of universes of an infinite past age”! If you cannot explain how *this finite* universe came to order by

mere chance, don't even think of trying to escape by devising an "infinite universe of universes"!

I think I have thus definitively proved the accusation I posed earlier (near the end of the second paragraph) that the propounders of such ideas as here exposed get trapped ever tighter in their own trappings! After which, the Nobel laureates *must* at long last stop repeating the now pitifully laughable *at (not, with)* "joke" of so-called "universe of universes in which all that can possibly happen just happened"!

And now finally, let us consider as best we can the problem of universal expansion: As we may not speak of the expansion of space, but only of the *volume* of the universe(s) contained in it, *either all the universes expand outward in unison, or else the (at least) one (ours) expands into the others!* In the first case, how indeed may we at all speak of *distinct* universes, rather than just of *only one*? And in the second case, just imagine yourself one moment stretched peacefully in your armchair to have in the very next moment your *personal* space invaded by elements of a *totally other* universe! If those elements be physically somewhat akin to the elements of this universe, you may well expect some sensible and *annoying if not catastrophic of yourself* interference! But *none of us ever had some such experience*, so where indeed is the "science" of all this their talking—despite the telling, though *solely of their own origin*, Hollywood "productions"?! And if they are so physically different as to cause no physical effect on you, how justified are you to speak of them as material at all? In this latter case, how indeed do those other universes differ at all from the universes of angels and devils, which the propounders of these ideas want to abolish? What they try to keep out of the door keeps coming in from the vast windows they leave open in their "reasoning"! The trouble is that God and His angels, once shown the door, in humility stay out—until they are gladly invited! *Only* the devils, as do the thieves, get in from the windows! And we all today see their ample effects!

One thing a (quasi-infinite) universe (even of universes) of an infinite past age *most definitely cannot do* is to show that it as a whole (or a part of it) has had a *finite* past age and is having a *finite* size showing both in the very structure of the laws that govern it and the incontestable details of its operation under those laws! Such as is proven by the three laws of Newtonian gravity, *constant* total mass and *constant* "gravitational constant" applying to *this entire* universe and its behavior under these laws!: In it, the cube of universal length is proportional to the square of the universal age; and the cubes of the mean planetary distances from the sun are proportional to the squares of the sidereal periods of the planets (Kepler's third law)! These are *not* by mere coincidence; the *same* law demands them both! Besides, even an infinite universe of universes *cannot* make its past history vanish by resetting the clock counting its age! Quite simply, its age *cannot* show in its laws, for it either makes infinite what it multi-

plies, or makes zero what it divides! What is written *is* written, and that admits no infinity! Most definitely, a finite universal age is *not* an idle matter! *Nor can it be expunged! Nor can it be ignored!* It *cries out in all directions* about the universe *having come into being*, as a *product* of action, *that is impossible without an acting actor other than itself!* If the acting actor had been the universe itself, it would *already* have been having a past when it acted, and thus also an age; and it could *not* have restarted counting its entire age from the moment it acted to “re-produce” itself—like a fickle woman, hiding its own true age in this sordid process! Even the most fickle woman, starting something *just now*, *cannot* state *her present* age as zero! If the universe could do so at a later time (the time appearing as zero age compatibly with the three laws mentioned just above), there *is nothing imaginable that could prevent it from doing so in its own true beginning*, that would then be so much more ancient yet *always* finite! Besides, *there is true dignity in very old age*; and so old a universe, being there on its own, does *not* have to report to anyone! On the other hand, what does not exist *has no consciousness of itself, nor can it act*; and therefore it *cannot even want* to bring itself into being; As *not* already existing, its *nonexistent prior* state is *unknown* to it, and the state into which it is about to come *is also unknown to it before it already exists!* If you *cannot* get flying by pulling on your shoestrings, then most certainly, a nonexistent (I may *not* even call it a “thing”), and so knowing *nothing* of existing, *cannot of itself* bring *its own unknown* nonexistent self into an unknown existing! I know not how to make myself any clearer about these issues standing meaningfully and definitively on the zero point of Creation! That others, presumed experts, pass them over indifferently is indicative—though solely of their own gravitatis! This is only yet another way of stating that *this one is the sole universe in existence*; that it has had a *zero* probability to get standing on its own; that *it got standing by Somebody other than itself*, contrary even to the “expert” opinion of Nobel Laureates!

All the rest is Judgment! Hoped for, prayed for, yet only by some; alas, very few! And feared, as nothing is feared worse, by most; struggling hopelessly to put it out of their maddened minds! But as another old friend used to say, “With God Supreme in His abode, *all* that really matters *is* well!” With so much shame heaped up upon themselves by Pseudogreeks and Pseudochristians during these “last of days”, the few still living Greeks and Christians of all Nations, the “salt of the earth” *must volunteer for extra, double and triple duty*: The Old Flame *must* be kept alive! The Apollonian Light and Music *must* still reverberate alive in the gaping void inside us, so that *not* all be swallowed up in the total frigid darkness, feverishly produced with *full, concerted, malicious* intent by its sinister multifacial agents! Sad thoughts? Not at all! Just look at the contrast! We indeed *are* lucky to live (and bear witness) in these interesting times!

With our best wishes to all for late Spring and Summer,

**Re: ΟΛΟΚΛΗΡΩΜΑΤΙΚΗ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΙΚΗ
ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΙΑ ΚΑΙ ΤΟ ΔΕΟΝ ΓΕΝΕΣΘΑΙ
ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟ ΠΕΡΙΒΑΛΛΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ ΑΕΙΦΟΡΙΑΝ**

Πρὸς τὸ T.E.E.,
Fax: 210-322-1772
(διὰ τὰ "ἐπωνύμως" τοῦ E. Δ.)

30 Ἀπριλίου 2007

Τὰ ἄρθρα τῶν κ.κ. Τ. Πέτρου καὶ Σ. Γαλιγαλῆ (Ε. Δ. 2430 καὶ 2436 ἀντιστοίχως) ἀπετέλεσαν *the last two straws that broke my back!* Ὡς καὶ πρὸ τῆς παγκοσμιοποιήσεως (ἄλλοπροσάλλως ἐναντιουμένης ὑπὸ ἐθνικοφρόνων, ἀριστεροφρόνων καὶ πάντων τῶν ὅπου γῆς ἀρνούμενων ἕως βάθους κατανοεῖν τὴν θείαν ἰσότητα τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων προσώπων, ἐπιβάλλουσιν ὅλως ἄλλην τῆς νῦν ἀντιμετώπισιν τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν προβλημάτων), οἱ πλείστοι ἐμμένοντες ἐπὶ τῆς διαφορικῆς καθ' ἑκάστον θεωρήσεως τῶν πραγμάτων ἐστιάζομένης ἐπὶ τοῦ "ἐγὼ νᾶμαι καλὰ καὶ ὁ κόσμος στὸν διάβολον"! Ὅτι καὶ ἡμεῖς οἱ μηχανικοί, πρῶτοι ὑποφαινόμενοι τοῦ παγκοσμίου πολιτισμοῦ, περιφρονούμεν τὴν παρὰ πάντων ὀφειλομένην ὁλοκληρωματικὴν θεώρησιν, ἣν ἡμεῖς χρὴ διδάσκειν ἑαυτοῖς τε καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς, ἀντιθέτως πρὸς τὸ κοινόν, γενικόν, ὅλως ῥηχόν, ἀνώριμον κάπρεπες πνεῦμα, ἐμβάλλει εἰς ζοφερὰς σκέψεις! Δι' ὃ τὸ παρόν:

Καταπλήσσει κυρίως ἡ περιφρόνησις τῆς *σκληρᾶς ἀληθείας* ὅτι ὡς ὁ πλανήτης ἀποτελεῖ κατὰ τὸ *μάλιστα* πλείστον *φυσικῶς* κλειστὸν σύστημα (πλὴν τῆς ῥοῆς ἐνεργείας καὶ ἐκροῆς ὑδρογόνου καὶ ἡλίου), ἀπαιτεῖ *συναντίληψιν* πασῶν *γενικῶς* τῶν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ *σχέσεων*, οὐχὶ δὲ *μόνων* τῶν *φυσικῶν*. Διὰ τοῦτο, ἡ ὑπὸ τινων προτεινομένη ταφὴ τοῦ CO₂ συνιστᾷ τὴν ἡλιθιωτάτην ποτὲ γενομένην πρότασιν *πλανητικῆς αὐτοκτονίας*, καθότι καὶ διασπᾷ τὸν φυσικὸν κύκλον ἀναδεσμεύσεως τοῦ ἄνθρακος διὰ τῆς φωτοσυνθέσεως, ἐνεργουμένης κυριώτατα ὑπὸ τῶν δασῶν, ἃ καταστρέφομεν παγκοσμίως διὰ τὸ μόνους ἡλιθίους προφανὲς "κέρδος" (ὅπερ διὰ τῆς ταφῆς ταύτης αὐξηθήσεται περαιτέρω!), καὶ *συνθάπτει* τὸ κατὰ τὰ 32/44 κατὰ βάρους *ἀναλογοῦν ὀξυγόνον, μονίμως ἀφαιρούμενον ἐκ τῆς ἀτμοσφαίρας* καὶ *πλέον μὴ προσφερόμενον οὐδ' εἰς τοὺς πνεύμονας τῶν ἀνθρώπων* καὶ ζώων! Δις ταῦτα διέφυγε τῆς συντακτῶν προσοχῆς, καθότι καὶ ἡ ἀπόρριψις τῆς χρήσεως τῆς *(ἀνευ μολύνσεως ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου παρεχομένης ἡμῖν) αἰολικῆς ἐνεργείας* *τάχιον εἰς θάνατον τὸ οἰκοσύστημα ὁδηγήσει* (προφανῶς ἵνα μὴ

ποσῶς ταραχθῶσι τὰ ἐδραίως πλὴν οὐχὶ ἐπὶ τὸ γενικὸν καλὸν ἐγκαθεστῶτα συμφέροντα, ἀπαιτοῦντα ἀεὶ *μείζονα, οὐκ ἐλάσσον'* ἀνάλωσιν ἄνθρακος)!

Ὅμως, κυριώτατα καταπλήσσει ὅτι ὡς καὶ μηχανικοὶ ἀγνοοῦμεν, εἰ οὐ καὶ περιφρονοῦμεν, τὴν *ἀνάγκην* συντάξεως *πλήρων ὑγιῶν ἰσοζυγίων θερμικῆς καὶ στοιχειακῆς-μοριακῆς τοπικῆς καὶ πλανητικῆς συνθέσεως τῆς βιοσφαίρας*, ὧν ἄνευ *πᾶσα* περὶ τοῦ θερμικοῦ προβλήματος καὶ τῆς τοῦ πλανήτου ἀειφορίας συζήτησις ἐστὶ μόνη μείζων ἔτι ἀπώλεια τοῦ τάχ' ἀπολείποντος χρόνου! Περὶ τίν' ἀντ' αὐτῶν ἐν Ἑλλάδι καὶ τῷ πλανήτῃ παντὶ καταδαπανῶμεν τὸν χρόνον σαφὲς πᾶσι τοῖς νοῦν ἔχουσι!

Δι' ὃ, ἐρωτῶμεθα πάντες: τίμι δικαίωματι καταδαπανῶμεν *μὴ ἀνανεώσιμα* ἀποθέματα ἐνεργείας καὶ πασιφανῶς ἀναγκαίων ὑλῶν, οὐχὶ κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τῆς *παγκοσμίου ἀνάγκης* ἀλλὰ τὴν *ἀμετρίαν* τῆς θρασυτήτος, ἰσχύος, ἐπιβολῆς, ἐπιβουλῆς, ἐπιθυμίας, πλούτου, καὶ *ἀσωτείας* ἐκάστου (περιλαμβάνουσιν καὶ τὰς *δαπάναις ἄλλων ὅλως προσχηματικὰς* δῆθεν *προσκυνηματικὰς θαλασσίας περιηγήσεις* τῶν οὐδόλως ὀρθῶς διδασκόντων λαοὺς οὐδ' ἐν διαλογισμῷ καὶ βαθείᾳ προσευχῇ ἀλλ' ἐν περιοδείαις διαπεραιουμένων τοῦ δῆθεν μοναχικοῦ βίου!);

Ἐρωτῶμεθα οἱ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ τόπῳ μηχανικοὶ πάντες: Πῶς συγκατανεύομεν εἰς καταφανέστατα ἀνασφαλῆ, πρόστυχα, πρόχειρα, ἐλλειπῆ, περιττά, αἰσχροῦ ποιότητος, βραχείας διαρκείας ὠφελίμου ζωῆς, μὴ λιτά, ἀκαλαίσθητα, συνολικῶς δὲ δαπανηρότατα καὶ τὸν πολιτισμὸν οὐδόλως προάγοντα ἔργα, *ἀσεβοῦντες πρὸς τὸν πολίτην καὶ τὸν πλανήτην*; Δυσνόητος τοῖς πολλοῖς ὁ περιεκτικὸς, σύντομος, δηκτικὸς λόγος; Π.χ., *τίμι* δικαίωματι μηχανικὸς θεωρεῖ ὅτι δικαιούται συμπράττειν εἰς τὸ μολύνειν διὰ τῆς διαχεομένης αἰωρουμένης κόνεως ὅλην τὴν πόλιν, ἄρ' οὖν καὶ *πᾶσαν* τὴν γῆν, ἐπὶ μῆνας μακροὺς, ἀντὶ τοῦ δομεῖν καὶ διαχειρίζεσθαι *πάντα* τὰ ὑπ' αὐτὸν *in a neat, clean and pollution-free manner*;

Ἐρωτῶμεθα οἱ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ τόπῳ μηχανικοὶ πάντες: Διὰ τοῦ Ε. Δ. τόννοι ἀναρίθμητοι ὅλοι χάρτου, δηλαδὴ *πολυτίμου δασικῆς ὕλης*, ἀναλίσκονται χάριν καὶ τῶν *ἐπιγνώστων κενολογιῶν* τῶν "παρατάξεων"! Πῶς οὖν ἄρα τολμῶμεν κενολογεῖν καὶ περὶ τοῦ πλανήτου; Ἀλλ' ἔστησαν ἡμῖν ποικιλῶνυμοι καθηγηταὶ ἀξιότατοι, ὧν οἱ λοιποὶ πάντες πισταὶ εἰκόνες εἰσὶ!

AUTHOR'S COMMENT: Ἐδημοσιεύθη.

Re: ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟ ΠΛΑΝΗΤΙΚΟΝ ΠΡΟΒΛΗΜΑ ΕΝΕΡΓΕΙΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΘΕΡΜΟΚΡΑΣΙΑΣ

Πρὸς τὸ T.E.E.,
Fax: 210-322-1772
(διὰ τὰ ἑπώνυμους τοῦ Ε. Δ.)

28 Ἰανουαρίου 2008.

Ὁ μὲν λόγος πολὺς περὶ τῶν νέου τύπου λαμπτήρων φωτισμοῦ, ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος *μόνον λεγομένων* ὅτι ἐξοικονομοῦσιν ἐνέργειαν, ὡς *οὐδεμία ὑπότινος παρεσχέθη πλήρης ἀνάλυσις τοῦ προβλήματος!* Ἀληθῶς, *μόνον ὅπου καὶ ὅτε* [πάντως δ' ὑπὸ τὸ φῶς τῶν κάτωθι ἐν (β) διαλαμβανομένων] *περιττῶς* οἱ φωτιζόμενοι χώροι θερμαίνονται διὰ τῶν λαμπτήρων πυρακτώσεως ἐπιβάλλεται αὐτῶν ἡ ἀντικατάστασις! Τοιοῦτοι χώροι εἰσὶ πάντες οἱ δημόσιοι ἀνοικτοὶ· χοῖ κλειστοὶ πλὴν ὅμως *μόνον κατὰ τὸ θέρος* ὅτε ὁ χρόνος ἀνάγκης φωτισμοῦ ἐστὶ λίαν βραχύτερος καὶ *μᾶλλον σπανίως* συμπίπτει ταῖς ὥραις αἰχμῆς! Κατὰ τὸν χειμῶνα ἡ ἀνάγκη παροχῆς τῆς διὰ τῶν νέων λαμπτήρων μὴ παρεχομένης θερμότητος ἀπλῶς μεταφέρεται εἰς *ἄλλον* μηχανισμόν, ὡς, π.χ., τὸν καυστήρα πετρελαίου! Ὅμως, *πῶς* ἀποδείκνυται ὅτι τοῦτ' ὄντως σώζει *παγκοσμίως καὶ τοπικῶς* ἐνέργειάν τε καὶ πλοῦτον, ὅτε ἀντὶ *γηγενῶν ὑλῶν* (παρ' ἡμῖν δὲ λιγνίτου) καίομεν πετρέλαιον *εἰσαγόμενοι*; Τίνος τότε ἐστὶν ἡ ὠφέλεια;

Τοῦ πλανήτου ὅλου ὄντος ἡμικλείστου συστήματος λήψεως, παραγωγῆς καὶ χρήσεως θερμότητος καὶ ἐνεργείας, τὸ ὅλον ἐρώτημα διασπᾶται εἰς:

(α) τίς ἡ *ἐλάσσων συνολικὴ δαπανομένη* τε καὶ μοιραίως ἐκλυομένη θερμότης ἢ *καθ' ἕκαστον τρόπον ἐνεχομένη* εἰς τὴν παραγωγὴν τε καὶ χρῆσιν τῆς παρ' ἡμῶν πάντων χρωμένης ἐνεργείας; Ὡς καὶ ἡ "βιομάζα", μὴ συλλεγομένη πρὸς καυσίν, συντελεῖ εἰς τὴν λίπανσιν ἀγρῶν καὶ δασῶν! *Πῶς* ἀποδείκνυται ὅτι ἡ χρῆσις λιπασμάτων παραγομένων βιομηχανικῶς ἐστὶ θερμικῶς, ἐνεργειακῶς καὶ χρηματικῶς οἰκονομικώτερα;

(β) τίς ἡ *συνολικὴ καὶ τοπικὴ* χρηματικὴ καθ' ἕκαστον τρόπον καταβαλλομένη κατὰ *πᾶσαν διακεκριμένην διεργασίαν* δαπάνη, ἀρχομένη ἀπὸ τῆς ἐξορύξεως τῶν ὑλῶν, τῆς κατεργασίας αὐτῶν εἰς καθαρὰ ὑλικά (ὡς ὕαλος, μέταλλα, χημικά, ἠλεκτρονικά, λιπασματα, *παντοειδῆ* μέσα μεταφορᾶς), τὴν κατασκευὴν τῶν ἀναγκαίων περὶ αὐτὰς ἐργαλείων καὶ νέων μᾶλλον ἔτι πειπλοκωτέρων κᾶρ' οὖν λίαν δαπανηροτέρων εἰς ἐνέργειαν, θερμότητα καὶ χρῆμα ἐγκαταστάσεων παραγωγῆς τῶν νέων λαμπτήρων ἀντὶ κείνων τῆς πυρακτώσεως; Ἐξοικονομοῦμεν ἂρ' ὄντως ἐνέργειάν τε καὶ

πλούτων, ἢ μήπως μείζον' ἄρα ποσὰ τούτων ἀνομολογήτως κάφανως δαπανῶμεν;

(γ) τίς τούτων τῶν δύο ἢ ἐλάσσων *συνολικὴ* περιβαλλοντικὴ ἀπὸ τῆς παραγωγῆς μέχρι τῆς ἀπορρίψεως ἐπιβάρυνσις; καὶ

(δ) τίς πρὸς τίνα ἢ περὶ ταῦτα πάντα ῥοὴ χρηματικοῦ πλούτου; Αἱ ἔταιρείαι παραγωγῆς ἀγαθῶν οὐκ εἰσὶν ἰδρύματα διανομῆς ἀλλὰ *παραγωγῆς* πλούτου, δι' οὗ μόνου κάλλιον πάντες διαβιοῦμεν, οὐ δὲ μόν' οἱ μέτοχοι κείνων πλουτίζουν ὥς τινες ἀφελῶς διατείνονται. Ὅμως, ὥς πάντες ἐσμέν μέτοχοι τοῦ πλανήτου, ἄρα πάντες ὀφείλομεν ἀποτιμᾶν ὥς ἄνω τὸ *σύνολον τῆς δαπάνης ὑλῶν τε καὶ πλούτου* καὶ μὴ τυφλῶς παρασύρεσθαι (ἄνευ τῆς ὥς ἄνω λεπτομεροῦς ἐξετάσεως τοῦ ὅλου προβλήματος) ὑπὸ *φαινομενικῶς* "δωρεάν" ἀρχικῆς διανομῆς νέου τύπου λαμπτήρων! Πᾶς νουνεχὴς ἐπὶ τέλους κατανοεῖτω! **I do very much hope, they do *not* attempt nor intend to get us hooked!**

Ἡ δὲ *δῆθεν* "ἐπιστημονικὴ" αὐτοδηλουμένη κοινότης δαπανᾷ *ἡμέτερον* πολύτιμον πλούτον ἀναζητοῦσα τὴν δῆθεν ὀριστικὴν λύσιν τοῦ ἐνεργειακοῦ προβλήματος τῆς Γῆς διὰ τῆς συντήξεως τοῦ ὑδρογόνου εἰς ἥλιον (Ε.Δ. 2472, σελ. 5). Πῶς οὐκ ἀντιλαμβάνονται ὅτι τοῦτο μοιραίως συνεπάγεται τὴν *αὔξησιν* τῆς συνολικῆς τελικῆς τῷ πλανήτῃ παρεχομένης (ἔστω καὶ ἐπ' αὐτοῦ παραγομένης) θερμότητος, ἅρ' οὖν καὶ τῆς θερμοκρασίας αὐτοῦ; Ἡ τοιαυτὴ "λύσις" οὐκ ἐστὶν ἄλλη τῆς φυσικῶς μὲν ἔστω βραδείας, φυσιολογικῶς δὲ *ταχείας* φοινικῆς ἡμῶν "ἐπιστημονικῶς" ἀναζητουμένης μετατροπῆς τῆς Γῆς εἰς *ἀληθῆ θερμικὴν κόλασιν*, χάριν τῆς *δῆθεν* ἀειφόρου "ἀναπτύξεως"! Ὡς ὁ Ἥλιος μοιραίως ἀδυνατεῖ ψύχεσθαι δαπάνη τῶν οἴκαδε παραγομένων ἐνεργείας τε καὶ θερμότητος, πλὴν μόνη τῇ ἐκλύσει αὐτῶν, ὁμοίως χῆ Γῆ! Ὡς ἤδη ἀδυνατοῦμεν κρατεῖν εὐκρατον τὸν πλανήτην, *μόνον χείρον* ὑποχρεούμεθ' ἀναμένειν ἀπὸ "λύσεων" ὥς ἢ ὥς ἄνω! Μόνη ἢ ἀρίστη δυνατὴ χρῆσις τῆς ἡμῖν παρεχομένης ἡλιακῆς ἐνεργείας (φωτεινῆς μὲν ἀπὸ χρόνων ἀρχαίων διὰ κατόπτρων συγκεντρομένης, *πλὴν ἐπὶ μόνης τῆς ἐπιφανείας τῆς Γῆς ἐγκαθισταμένων*, ὥς ὅτι ἄλλως *αὔξηθήσεθ'* ἡ συνολικὴ τῇ Γῇ παρεχομένη ἐνέργεια· αἰολικῆς δὲ κατὰ τὸν ἀποδοτικώτερον σύγχρονον τρόπον) δύναται τηρεῖν σταθερὰν τὴν θερμοκρασίαν ἐπὶ τῆς Γῆς, ὥς οὐδεμίαν ἐπιφέρει προσθήκην θερμότητος. Διδομένων δὲ καὶ τῶν ἀστρονομικῶς τῷ πλανήτῃ τιθεμένων ὁρίων, πάντα τὰ ψευδπιστημονικῶς διδασκόμενα περὶ διαστρικῶν ταξιδίων φυγῆς *τινῶν μόνων* δαπάναις τῆς ἀπὸ τῆς Γῆς ἐνεργείας καθίσταται παντελῶς καταγέλαστα. Ἡ σύμπραξις "ἐπιστημόνων" καὶ **Hollywood** μόνον *νοσηροῦς* μύθους κατασκευάζει, ὧν τὰς συνεπείας ἤδη πάντες "ἀπολαμβάνομεν"! Αἱ ἄτεγκτοι ζωὴ καὶ θερμοδυναμικὴ ὅλως ἄλλα διδάσκουσι!

AUTHOR'S COMMENT: Ἦγνοήθη. Ὅτι πικρὰ ἢ Ἀλήθεια!

**Re: Η ΤΩΝ ΓΛΥΠΤΩΝ ΜΑΡΜΑΡΩΝ
ΠΑΡΑ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΔΙΗΚΟΥΣΑ
ΒΑΡΒΑΡΟΣ ΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΒΛΑΣΦΗΜΟΣ ΣΥΛΗΣΙΣ**

Μυριοτρόπως αὐτοβασανισθέντες ἐνεκαινιάσαμεν τελικῶς τὸ τῆς Ἀκροπόλεως νέον Μουσεῖον! Ὡς εἰκός, ἡ διένεξις οὐκ ἦν περὶ τᾶριστον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀεὶ παρὰ Νεο"έλλησι" περὶ τὰ προσωπικὰ κακοήθη συμφέροντα! Ὅτι τοιοῦτοι γεγόναμεν καὶ περὶ τοιαῦτ' ἐμμένομεν ἀσχολεῖσθαι! Τόλμησον γυρόσε ἰδεῖν, ἀρχόμενός γε ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ! Ἄρ' οὖν ἐσμέν ὄντως ἡμεῖς κατὰ πλειονότητα, ἔστω, καὶ γρηγοροῦσαν συνείδησιν Ἑλληνες, ἢ τι ἄλλο; Εἴ τι ἄλλο, τί ὄντως ἄλλο; Εἴ τι ἄλλο, ἄρα καταχρώμεθα τῷ Ἑλλήνων ὀνόματι! Κατανοήσωμεν τοῦτο: Οὐ γεινᾶται τις Ἑλλήν, γίγνεται! Διὰ πάσης τῆς χαρακτῆρας, πνεύματα καὶ ψυχὰς μόνῃς ὀρθῶς παιδευούσης Ἑλλήνων παιδείας, ἣν ἡ παρούσα τῆς Χώρας εἰκὼν καταδείκνυσι σκαιῶς περιφρονουμένην, παρὰ πᾶσαν ἡλιθίαν τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ δῆθεν "ἐπιφανῶν" δήλωσιν!

Καὶ παρήλασαν κατὰ τὰ ἐγκαίνια οἱ "ἐπίσημοι", ἐντόπιοί τε καὶ ὅσοι τῶν ξένων οὐκ ἔσχον, καθ' ἐκάστου τὴν κρίσιν, διαπράξαι τι "κάλλιον" τοῦ ἐλθεῖν! Σημεῖον καὶ τὸ τῶν νῦν διαγομένων καιρῶν! Οἱ κληθέντες ξένοι διάσημοι, ἐπιγνώστως ἔνοχοι ὄντες, ἠρνήθησαν παραστῆναι!: Ὅτι τὰ κείνων μουσεῖα κατὰ τὸ πλεῖστον ξένων, οὐχὶ ἐπιτοπίων Μουσῶν ἔργα στεγάζουσιν. Ὡν ἄνευ, κενά τε κάσῃμαντ' ἂν ἦσαν! Κανάλογά γε τῶν ἐκθεμάτων μουσείων καὶ τῶν ταῦτα περιβαλλουσῶν πόλεων καὶ χωρῶν καὶ τὰ ἔσοδα, περὶ ἃ νῦν ἀποκλειστικὸν ἐνδιαφέρον! Μὴ βλακευώμεθα: τὸ περὶ τὰ μουσεῖα κύριον μέλημα, πλὴν τῶν ἀπὸ τούτων ἐσόδων, οὐκ ἐστὶν ἡ μνημόνευσις καὶ διδασκαλία τῆς συναισθήσεως τῆς αἰτίας ἧς χάριν αἱ Μοῦσαι παρεκίνησαν τοὺς ἔργων δημιουργούς, ἀλλ' ἡ ὅλως ἀμφίβολος "δόξα" τῆς κατοχῆς τῶν ἐκτιθεμένων, ἐπιτευχθείσης ὡς καὶ διὰ φόβου, ληστείας, πειρατείας, συλήσεως τάφων τε καὶ λειτουργούντων ἢ μὴ ναῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ! Διὰ τοὺς "ἐνδόξους" τῆς γῆς, μηδὲν σημαίνουσι τὰ τοιαῦτα! Εἰς τὸ μὴ ὅλως εἶναι, συνειδητῶς, μετ' ἀπεριγράπτου κακίας διὰ τῆς "ἐπιστήμης" καὶ τῆς λεγομένης "διανοήσεως" ἐξωρίσαμεν τὸν Θεόν, ἀναπτύσσοντες ὅλως σατανικὰς κατ' ἐμπνευσιν "θεωρίας", πρὸς ὑποστήριξιν τῶν σκοτεινοτάτων ἡμῶν σκέψεων τε καὶ πράξεων! Κὰς τὴν θέσιν Ἐκείνου ἑαυτοὺς ἀνυψώσαμεν, ὡς ἡμῶν ἕκαστος δύναται, κατ' ἰδίαν ἰσχύν, πλοῦτον τε καὶ θρασύτητα! Οἱ αἰῶνες διδάσκουσιν, ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς σχεδὸν πάντες ὡς οὐδὲν διδασκόμεθα!

Μὴ γὰρ σπεύσης ἄλλοις μόνοις προσάψαι τὴν ἐνοχήν: Οἱ Πέρσαι οὐχὶ διὰ τὸν πλοῦτον αὐτῆς κατὰ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐπήλθον, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ κοσμοκρατορῆσαι! Οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι διὰ τὴν ἄμυναν συνήνωσαν ὑπ' αὐτοὺς ὅσους τῶν Ἑλλήνων αὐτοῖς συνησπίσθησαν. Διὰ τοῦ κοινοῦ πλούτου πάντων αὐτῶν ὠκοδομήθη ὁ Παρθενών! [Καὶ μὴ λησμονῶμεν τὴν *μηδέποτε καθ' ὅλην τὴν ἱστορίαν ὁμολογουμένην συμβολὴν δούλων διαρπαγέντων, ἢ ὡς τοιούτων ἔτι ἐργαζομένων ἐπὶ παντὸς προσώπου τῆς γῆς!* Ἐρώτησον γὰρ σαυτὸν πότε, διὰ ποίων καταγεγραμμένων, ὡς καὶ αὐταῖς ταῖς ἱεραῖς Βίβλοις, πρὸς πάντας αὐστηρῶν νοθετικῶν λόγων, καὶ μέσων, ταραχῶν, θυσιῶν αἵματος, ἐν ἐκάστῳ τόπῳ διὰ παντὸς τρόπου καὶ χρόνου ὡς ἀναθροῦντες ἂ ὀπώπαμεν *"Ἀνθρωποὶ ὄντως κατηργήσαμεν τὴν δουλείαν!* Τολμᾶς ὁμολογεῖν ὅτι οὐδέποτε; Ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ὡς καὶ τὰ μουσεῖα τῶν δῆθεν πεπολισμένων συμπράττουσι; Μὴ τάχ' ἀντιπαρέρχου τὴν δεινὴν ταύτην ἐρώτησιν. Οὐχ ὠραῖοι εἰσὶν οἱ περὶ δῆθεν "δημοκρατίας" *δυναστῶν* λόγοι! (Δημοκρατία ἐστὶ τὸ κράτος τοῦ Δήμου, ἥτοι τοῦ *Κοινοῦ τοῦ Δήμου Καλοῦ, the diligent care about the Common Weal and Wealth*, οὐχὶ ἡ τῶν νῦν *ψευδελλήνων* δημοκρατία, ἐν ᾗ ἔνιοι δημόται κατὰ τὸ συμφέρον αὐτοῖς μόνοις περιάγουσι τὸν ὅλον Δῆμον εἰς πάνδεινα! Οὐκ αἰεὶ ἐπὶ τὸ Καλὸν ἐστὶν ὅπερ καλοῦμεν "δημοκρατίαν"! Συνήθως προάγεται ὡς προκάλυμμα πρὸς διασπορὰν εἰς πολλοὺς τῆς εὐθύνης διὰ τὰ *μεγάλα ἐγκλήματα* τῶν ὀλίγων!). Τόλμησον ἕως βάθρων ἰδεῖν τὰ "πολιτισμοῦ" ἔργα! Ὅτι περὶ *παντὸς* λόγον δώσεις!] Ἡ ἄτη τοῦ Περικλέους (καὶ τῶν δημαγωγῶν) ἐνεπόδισεν αὐτὸν τιθασεῦσαι τὴν περὶ πολέμου, ἥτοι ἐπὶ *κακῷ*, ἐπιθυμίαν τοῦ Δήμου! Ἐτη ἑπτὰ τε καὶ εἴκοσιν ὁ πόλεμος ἐκεῖνος διήρκεσε καὶ κατέστρεψε τὰς Ἀθήνας καὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα! Μόνοι διπλωματοῦχοι ἡλίθιοι οὐδέποτε διερωτῶνται πόσος καὶ ποῖος κατεδαπανήθη πλοῦτος ἀνθρώπων τε καὶ φυσικῶν πόρων τε καὶ πραγμάτων, ἢ *τουλάχιστον* ποῖα καὶ πόσα κατακόπησαν δάση ἵνα δομηθῶσι τριήρεις (χϋστέρον ἔτι μείζονα πολεμικὰ πλοῖα) ποντισθεῖσαι ὡς αὐτάνδροι ἐν ναυμαχίαις καὶ τρικυμίαις! Ἐρώτησον ἐπὶ τέλους σαυτὸν τί ὄντως ἐπεζήτησαν οἱ Ἕλληνες ὡς τῶν Περσῶν μισθοφόροι! Ἐρώτησον ἐπὶ τέλους σαυτὸν τί ἐπεζήτησαν Ἀλέξανδρος καὶ οἱ Ἕλληνες ὥστ' ἐκστρατεῦσαι κατὰ τῶν Περσῶν, ἀντὶ γε τοῦ *ὀργανικῶς ἐνω*σαι τὸν ἐλληνικὸν κόσμον ἅπαντα εἰς ἓν *σεμνὸν* βασιλείον κράτος! Ὁ ἐξελληνισμὸς τῆς Ἀσίας; ψευδής, βραχύς, ὅλως *ἀνύπαρκτος!* Μετ' ὀλίγους αἰῶνας, οἱ ἐκεῖ Ἕλληνες ὅλως ἀπερροφήθησαν, χηὶ Ἑλλάς, χάριν ἀρπαγῆς ξένου πλούτου, ἐστερήθη τῶν ἀρίστων αὐτῆς τέκνων καὶ τῶν ἀπογόνων αὐτῶν! Ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος, οὐ μόνον ἐμήδησεν, οὐ μόνον ἔλαβε καὶ δευτέραν (Περσίδα) σύζυγον, ἀλλὰ χέαυτον ἀνύψωσεν εἰς Θεόν! Ναί! Αὐτός πρῶτος! Ὁμολογήσωμεν ἐπὶ τέλους: *Μόνος* τῆς ἐκστρατείας ἐκείνης σκοπὸς ἦν ἡ *θρασεῖα διαρπαγὴ* τοῦ Περσῶν πλούτου, ἥς χάριν ὄντως ἐπτώχευσεν ἡ Ἑλλάς καὶ πρώτη αὐτὴ μετ' οὐ πολὺν χρόνον μειζόνως κατεληστεύθη ὑπὸ τῶν Ῥωμαίων! Μέγα ἱστορικὸν

πλήν ἕως τῆς νῦν περιφρονηθὲν παγκόσμιον δίδαγμα: "Ὅτι καὶ νῦν κατὰ πάσης ἐκείνης τῆς κόσμου περιοχῆς, διὰ τὸν πλοῦτον αὐτῆς, ἐκστρατεύει ἡ δῆθεν πεπολιτισμένη, δῆθεν Χριστιανικὴ, οὐσία Θεοῦ βλάσφημος καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πάλιν πτωχεύουσα Δύσις (ὡς καὶ τῆς Ἑλλάδος συμμετεχοῦσης ὡς καὶ κατακλυζομένης ὑπὸ τῶν ἀπὸ κείνων τῶν τόπων προσφύγων), τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ Ἐκκλησιῶν πασῶν σιωπουσῶν, αὐτὴ γε ἡ Δύσις τῶν περιλάμπρων μουσειῶν, ἡ παντάπασιν ἀρνούμενη ἀποδοῦναι τὰ κλαπέντα τε καὶ διαρπαγέντα τοῖς ναοῖς τε καὶ τόποις τε καὶ λαοῖς ἀφ' ὧν αὐτὰ ἀφηρέθησαν! Οὐ γὰρ πάντα βιαίως. Ὡς ὅτι ἀπαίδευτοι, καθ' ὅλα βάρβαροι ἐπιτόπιοι ψευδέλληγες τε καὶ ἄλλοι, ἀντὶ ἀργυρίων κατετεμάχισαν καὶ ἐπώλησαν τὴν ἀτίμητον κληρονομίαν τῶν ἑαυτῶν ἰδίων προγόνων, λησμονήσαντες πᾶν τὸ δι' αὐτῆς δίδαγμα! Οὐαὶ ἡμῖν πᾶσι!

Διὰ φωνῶν "γλυκυτάτων", πλήν περισπουδάζτως ἀνευ τινὸς ἁλατος ἄρ' οὐν καὶ νύξεως συνειδήσεως, αἱ ἐγκαινίων περιγραφαί, ὥσθ' ἅπαντα τὸν θόρυβον γενέσθαι περὶ τὴν προσέλευσιν πολιτισμικῶς ὅλως ἀσημάντων προσώπων, τὴν λάξευσιν λίθων καὶ τὸ τίς ἄρα ἡ ὀρθὴ θέσις ἐκθέσεως τούτου ἢ κείνου τοῦ θραύσματος διαρπαγέντος ἢ μή. Καὶ ἠκούσαμεν φλυαρίας περὶ τέχνης ὑπὸ ἀτέχνων, περὶ "πολιτισμοῦ" ὑπὸ ἀπολιτίστων πλήν μόνον κατ' ὄνομα, περὶ "δημοκρατίας" ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπιμελῶς κρυπτομένων ἀπὸ τοῦ Δήμου καὶ μόνον τολμώντων δοῦναι "συνειντεύξεις" ἐπὶ τῶν ἐν Ἑλλάδι πραγμάτων δεσμίους συκοφάνταις δημοσιογράφοις ἐπὶ τούτῳ μεταφερομένοις δωρεάν (ἧτοι γὰρ δαπάναις τοῦ Δήμου) ὅπου μὴ ἐλληνικῆς γῆς, περὶ "ιερότητος" ὑπὸ ἀποδεδειγμένως μὴ τι ἐχόντων ἱερόν τε καὶ ὅσιον! Καί γε ἀπολύτως οὐδὲν περὶ τῆς συνολικῆς σημασίας τοῦ ποτε στηθέντος ὅλου οἰκοδομήματος, ἵνα μὴ πως οἱ νέοι βάρβαροι νυχθῶσι τῇ συνειδήσει! Διὰ τῆς τοιαύτης "λιτότητος" τῆς "λαμπρᾶς" τελετῆς, ἀπεσιωπήθη ἡ ἀρχαία οὐσία ἡ κατασχύνουσα πάντας τοὺς ἔκτοτε ἐπιγόνους, ἐπιτοπίους καὶ ἄρπαγας!

Ὡς ὅτι διατί ἄραγε τάρχαϊον οἰκοδόμημα Παρθενῶν ὠνομάσθη ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων σεβομένων ἀπολύτως τὴν γλώσσαν; Τίς ἦν ἡ Παρθένος, ἡ κληθεῖσα καὶ Ἀειπάρθενος; Τυχούσα θήλειά τις θεότης; Οὐχί!!! Ἀλλ' αὐτὴ αὕτη ἡ τελεία, αἰδίως ὥριμος, ἐν παντὶ ἀκατανίκητος, ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ Διὸς [καὶ γὰρ "Θεὸς" σημαίνει τὸ Ζεὺς-Διός: ἔτι οἱ Ἰσπανοὶ ὡς θ προφέρουσι τὸ ζ: Aznar, Zapatero· ὁδοντικά εἰσι τὰ τ, δ, θ, διπλοῦν τὸ ζ = σ + δ] καὶ τῆς κοιλίας τῆς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καταποθείσης κὰν τῇ κεφαλῇ Αὐτοῦ ἔκτοτε ἀκεραίως κατοικούσης Μήτιδος (= Σωφροσύνης) διὰ πόνων φρικτῶν γεννηθεῖσα Θεοῦ Νόησις ἢ Ἀθηνᾶ! [Ἀρχαῖοι θεογονικοὶ μῦθοι; Οὐδ' ἐπὶ στιγμῇ! Μόνος ἐπίπονος φιλοσοφικώτατος ἀποκαθαρμός, ὡς τότε ἦν δυνατός, τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀντιλήψεως ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ! Ἡ ὅλη τῶν Ἑλλήνων Θεογονία ἦν περὶ χωρισμοῦ ἀπολύτου τοῦ ἀρχῆθεν ἐκ τῆς Γαίας καὶ τῶν πεποιημένων πραγμάτων λεχθέντος Θεοῦ, καὶ ἀνυψώσεως Αὐτοῦ πέραν ὡς καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὑφ' ὅρασιν Οὐρανοῦ!] Διὰ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς, οὐσίᾳ, οἱ Ἕλληνες

ὠμίλουν περὶ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ιδιότητος τοῦ *αἰδίδως τε καὶ τελείως ἀοράτως* νοεῖν, ἢ ἄλλως, περὶ τῆς Θεοῦ *αἰδίδου, τελείας, ἀοράτου τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς*, ὑπὸ τοῦ *Καθαροῦ* Νοῦ μόνου διεργαζομένου πάντα τὰ πράγματα κατανοητῆς γενομένης Σοφίας! Καὶ προὔτιμῃσαν τὸν Μέγαν ἀεὶ γεωμετροῦντα Θεὸν παθόντα κατὰ τὴν Αὐτῆς Γέννησιν, ἢ Αὐτὴν γεννηθεῖσάν ποθ' ὡς βρέφος, ἀδύναμον, ἄβουλον, ἄσοφον! Οἱ Ἕλληνες προὔτιμῃσαν τὸν Θεὸν *αἰδίδως διεργασθέντα ἐπὶ Σκοπὸν* τὴν Αὐτοῦ Νόησιν καὶ Σοφίαν· λέξεσιν ἄλλαις, *ἀπολύτως μηδὲν ἀφέντα* τῇ παρ' ἡμῶν καὶ δῆθεν "ἐπιστημονικῶς" λατρευομένη τυφλῶς ἐπὶ *μηδένα εὐγενῆ σκοπὸν* πορευομένη ἐξελίζει, ἢ τῇ μηδέποτε λεχθείσῃ πῶς ἐμπραγμάτως ἐγκατασταθείσῃ ὡς ἂν ἡ νόμος ἀκαθοριστίᾳ, ἢ τῇ ὅλως ἀνόμῳ τύχῃ τῇ ἐνεργούσῃ σχετικιστικῶς (ἀλλὰ *πῶς ὄντως οὐ* λέγεται!) διὰ τάνθρωπινον *βλασφήμου σοφίσματος* τάχανοῦς "χωροχρόνου", ἐν ᾧ πᾶς καὶ πᾶν αὐτονόμως λογίζεται ἐν τῷ κέντρῳ αὐτοῦ ἐγκαθεστηκώ(ό)ς, τοῦ ὑποκαταστήσαντος αὐτὸν τὸν Θεόν· ἅτινα πάντ' ἀπὸ τοῦ 1985 ἐπισήμως κατέρρευσαν ἄλλ' οὐδέποτε ἔκτοθ' ὠμολογήθησαν, ἵνα μὴ βλαβῶσι *πάντα τάπιν τοῦ κόσμου παντὸς καταπιεστικῶς ἐγκαθεστῶτα συμφέροντα*, τὰ θέλοντα δοῦλον τὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ Ἄγνωστον αὐτῷ τὸν τοῦτον ἐλευθεροῦντα Θεόν! *Τίνα* τῶν παραστάντων δοκεῖς ἱκανὸν περὶ τῶν τοιούτων ποιεῖν λόγον τινὰ γυμνὸν ἕνα; Δι' αὐτοὺς, λίθοι καὶ "μάρμαρα" εἰσὶν αἱ ἀπεικονίσεις ἀνθρωπίνων ψυχῶν καὶ πνευμάτων καλλιεργούντων ἑαυτὰ καὶ περιβαλλόντων αὐτόν γε τὸν Πατέρα Θεόν, διδόντων *σαφὲς καθαρὸν καθ' ὅλ' ἀπτόν νόημα* τῇ Ἀιδίῳ Θεῖᾳ Σοφίᾳ! Ταῦτα οὐκ ἔστι "πολιτισμός", ὡς νῦν οὗτος ὁ ὅρος ἐκφέρεται ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἐπὶ στιγμὴν πῶς κατανοεῖται, ἀλλ' ὁ ὀρισμὸς τῆς *ἡνωμένης Θεοῦ τε καὶ Ἀνθρώπου Πνευματικότητος*. Ἀλλὰ περὶ ταύτης, οἱ "σύγχρονοι" λόγους *κεινοὺς* μόνον ἐκφέρουσιν!

Ὡς τοιαῦτα "σύγχρονοι" *ψευδεπιστημονικαὶ* ὑπ' ἀγρίων ἀνέμων δερόμεναι "θεωρίαι" καὶ "πεποιθήσεις" ὠθοῦσι τὸν *ἄκοσμον* "κόσμον" ἡμῶν! Οἱ ἀενάως κινούμενοι μεταξὺ τελετῶν καὶ συνωμοτικῶν συνενεργεσιῶν κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων οὐκ ἔχουσι χρόνον ἀσχολεῖσθαι περὶ τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐσιώδη, ἀλλὰ περὶ μόνους τοὺς λίθους, λελαξευμένους ἢ μή! Οὐδόλως αὐτοὺς διαφέρει ὅτι ὁ Θεός, *πλέον τοῦ νοεῖν μόνον ἐπ' ἄριστα, ὡσαύτως καὶ αὐτεμπνέεται τε καὶ ἐνεργεῖ, αἰδίδως Εἷς παντάπασιν Τέλειος Ὡν* Λόγος διὰ τοῦ *νοεῖν καὶ λογίζεσθαι, τοῦ ἐπ' ἄριστ' αὐτεμπνέεσθαι καὶ τοῦ αὐτεκφράζεσθαι-ἐνεργεῖν!* Οὗτοι ὑστεροβούλως ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν ἐμπνεόμενοι, οὐδὲν ἀπολύτως μαθάνουσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἁγίου Θεοῦ, τῶν ἀρχαίων κακέκτυπα γεγονότες! Διὰ τοῦτο οὐδὲν περὶ Ἀθηνᾶς καὶ Θεοῦ ἤκουσας κατὰ τὰ τοῦ νέου Μουσείου ἐγκαίρια!

Ἦκουσας ὅμως περὶ "δημοκρατίας", ἥτοι τὸ *τούτων ἐκείνης κακέκτυπον!* Τὰ Παρθενῶνος κοσμήματα *εἰκόνες* ἦσαν τῶν ἀρχαίων Ἀγίων δημοσίως ἀμιλλωμένων ἐπὶ *τελειότητι*! Οἱ νῦν ἐν παραβύστῳ κατ' ἀλλήλων συνωμοτοῦσιν ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι, σκοποῦντες εἰς πολιτικὸν καὶ χρηματικὸν κέρ-

δος, οὐχὶ τὴν ἀρίστευσιν! Τὸ Πνεῦμα τ' Ἀνθρώπου χη' ἐκάστου Ἀνθρώπου ψυχὴ οὐδόλως αὐτοὺς συγκινεῖ πλην μόνον ἐὰν κέρδος αὐτοῖς ἀποφέρῃ! Τὰ Παρθενῶνος στολίσματα ὡς ζώντων ἀγίων δημοσίως ἀμιλλωμένων ἀλλήλοις ἐπὶ τελειότητα ἀπεικονίσαις ἔκτοτε καταγγέλλουσιν ἀκριβῶς πάντας τοὺς κατὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ συνωμότης! Διὰ τοῦτο οὐδεμία περὶ τῆς σημασίας τῶν "μαρμάρων" ἐγένετο νύξις! Ἄλλ' ἄρα καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, πᾶσα σύλλησις, πᾶσα σκύλευσις, πᾶσα βεβήλωσις κατ' Αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ φέρεται! Οὐδόλως πως παντὶ ὑστέρω ἀνθρωπίνῳ περὶ Θεοῦ δόγματι ἔξεστι καταστρέφειν παρελθουσῶν γενεῶν ἀφιερώματα τῇ Θεῷ Σοφίᾳ. Μόνον ἀπ' αὐτῶν διδάσκεσθ' ὀφείλει, ἐπ' ἔτι μείζον' ἀνθρωπίνην παιδείαν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν! Ὅπερ οὐδέποτε ἐποίησαν οἱ ἐξ Ἀσίας ἐνσκήψαντες "Χριστιανοί" ἀσιατικά δόγματα ἐνεγκόντες, ὡς μηδὲν ἀπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων μεμαθηκότες.

Ἄντ' αὐτοῦ, πάντες οἱ ἔκτοτε τοὺς ἀρχαίους ναοὺς τῶν Ἑλλήνων σκυλεύσαντες Ῥωμαῖοι, καὶ Χριστιανοὶ μόνον κατ' ὄνομα, οὐδὲν καταφαίνονται κατανοεῖν τῶν τοιούτων. Πολυτιμώτερος αὐτοῖς ὁ διὰ τῶν σκυλευμάτων ἴδιος πλουτισμὸς καὶ τὸ δημόσιον συλλεγόμενον χρήμα, ἢ τὸ αἷτημα τῆς Θεῆς Δικαιοσύνης ὥστ' ἀποδοθῇ ἐπὶ τέλους τῷ Παρθενῶνι ἡ τιμὴ ἡ δέουσα τῷ Θεῷ μόνῳ, ὅπου μόνους καθαροὺς, σεμνοὺς, κάνυποδήτοις ἔξεστι παρίστασθ' ἐν ἀπολύτῳ σιγῇ!

Οἱ ἐξ Ἀσίας ἐπελθόντες τῆς νέας θρησκείας δῆθεν πιστοί, οὐσίᾳ ἀπαίδευτοι περὶ τὴν φιλοσοφικὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀρχαίαν θρησκείαν, ἐξέλαβον πάντα τὰρχαί' ἀφιερῶμαθ' ὡς δῆθεν εἰδωλολατρῶν ἔργα, κοῦδ' ἐπὶ στιγμὴν ἀντελήφθησαν τὴν ἐπὶ τὰνθρωπίνου προσώπου ἀπεικόνισιν τῆς ὡς ἄνω ὁλότητος τῆς καθαρῶς πνευματικῆς Θεῆς Οὐσίας. Παρ' αὐτῶν ἤρξατο ἡ καταστροφή τῶν ἀρχαίων ναῶν, ὁμοῦ δ' ὡς εἰκὸς χη' αὐτῶν ξένωσις ἀπὸ τῆς γνώσεως τὰληθοῦς Θεοῦ θελήματος! Ἐνετείλατο ὁ Κύριος τὸ "πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη"; Οὗτοι περιφρονήσαντες τὴν Χριστοῦ ἐντολήν, μοναῖς ἐνεκλείσθησαν, κάκεῖ, διὰ νηστειῶν τε καὶ προσευχῶν προσεπάθησαν προσπαθοῦσι σώσαι τὰς ἑαυτῶν ψυχὰς μόνας, περὶ τῶν λοιπῶν λέγοντες ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἔξοι, ἦτοι ἐπ' Αὐτοῦ φορτοῦντες τὸ ὅλον ἔργον τῆς τῶν λοιπῶν σωτηρίας (πάντῃ οὐδ' ἐπὶ στιγμὴν παρορῶντες καὶ τὸν κοινὸν πλοῦτον καὶ πλουτισμόν! Ὡς τῆς οὕτω τριπλῆς αὐτῶν φιλαυτίας! Ἐν ταῖςδε γ' ἡμέραις ἔσχομεν κάν Ἑλλάδι σχετικὰ δῆθεν "ἐννόμως", πλην παρανόμως παραγραφέντα ὡς καὶ μοναχῶν κακουργήματα, προφανέστατα ἀπ' ἐντὸς αὐτῆς γε τῆς "Ἐκκλησίας" ἄνωθεν ἐνταλθέντα, ἐφ' ὅσον οὐδέποτε κείθεν καταδικασθέντα!) Ἄλλ' οὗτοι λέγουσιν ὅτι ἐν μοναῖς δῆθεν προσεύχονται ὅπως ὁ Θεὸς σώσῃ ἡμᾶς!; Ἄρα, ἡ Χριστοῦ ἐπὶ γῆς πολιτεία ἐν κοινωνίᾳ οὐκ ἐστὶ τοῦτοις ὑπόδειγμα σὺν Θεῷ βίου! Τοῦ Κυρίου εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐλθόντος, οὗτοι οὐσίᾳ ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου ἐχωρίσαντο ἑαυτοὺς, ὅμως ἀπομυζῶντες αὐτόν! Ἐπ' αἰῶνας ἀπολύτως οὐδὲν ποιήσαντες περὶ τὸ ἐκχριστιανίζειν Ἀσίαν (καὶ Ἀφρικὴν!), ὡς νέοι κατακτηταὶ κατὰ κείνης ἐπῆλθον [μετά γε, διὰ τὴν

ἔλλειψιν ἐκεῖ τῆς διδασκαλίας Χριστοῦ δι' αὐτῶν, τὴν ἐκεῖ ἐμφάνισιν ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς ἀρχαίας πηγῆς νεωτέρας, ὅμως δ' ἔτι φανατικωτέρας τῆς πρώτης, θρησκείας καθ' ὑπόδειγμα καθαρῶς ἀσιατικόν], ὡς ἔτι ποιοῦσι ἄχρι τῆς σήμερον, ἀδιακρίτως τοῦ αἵματος ὃ καταχέεται ἐπὶ προφανεῖ κέρδει! Οὐδ' πρό, οἱ περιφανεῖς τῆς Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας ταγοί, ἀπολύτως οὐδέν κατ' ἀνδρικὸν θάρρος ἔχουσι λέγειν!

Πρὸ τῶν ἐν ταῖς Γραφαῖς "Ἐν ἀρχῇ..." δύο ἱστάμενος, καὶ ἐρωτῶν αὐτοὺς ποῖον τούτων ὄντως ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ λαμβάνεις τὸ κατ' ἀποστήθην, "ὁ Χριστὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος"! Ἄρα, κατ' αὐτοὺς, οὔτε πρὸ τῆς Ἐνανθρωπήσεως ἦν Λόγος, οὔτε ὁ Πατὴρ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμά εἰσι Λόγος! Οὐδεμίαν ἄρα συναίσθησιν οἱ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ταγοὶ ἔχουσι περὶ τῆς *Οὐσίας* τοῦ Λόγου! Τῷ ἐλληνικῷ λόγῳ χρῶνται, ἀλλ' ἡ *Οὐσία* τοῦ Λόγου παντελῶς ἀπ' αὐτῶν διαφεύγει, καίτοι λαβόντων πτυχία "Θεολογίας", καίτοι καθεζομένων ἐφ' ἑδρῶν καθηγητικῶν, χύψηλῶν ἐπισκοπικῶν θρόνων! Εἰς *τρεις* ἀπ' ἀλλήλων διακριτοὺς, *ἐνα ἕκαστον ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἔλλειπῇ* διεχώρισαν τὸν Ἀδιαίρετον Ἐνα Ὅλον Θεόν, ἄρ' οὐ καὶ πρὸ τῆς Ἐνανθρωπήσεως καὶ μετὰ! Τοιαύτη ἐστὶν αὐτῶν ἡ "εὐσέβεια"! Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μετὰ τῆς καὶ οὕτω δηλουμένης ὡς τοιαύτης πορεύονται! Ὅτι "ὁ Χριστὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος" αὐτοῖς οὐδόλως ἐξήρκεσεν ὥστε μὴ καλεῖσθαι, κυριώτατα ἐν Ἐκκλησίαις Χριστοῦ, "Πατέρες", "Θεοφιλέστατοι", "Μακαριώτατοι", "Παναγιώτατοι", "Αὐτῶν Θειότατοι Παναγιότητες", "Ἅγιοι Πατέρες"!

Μεθ' ὅλην δισχιλιετίαν, παρὰ καὶ τοὺς Ἕλληνας καὶ τὸν Χριστόν, ὡς ἡμεῖς βῆμα οὐδὲν πεποιήκαμεν Οὐρονόσε, πλεον παρ' οὐδενὸς ἐκζητεῖται ἢ *πλείων τε καὶ ὀρθῇ* Θεοῦ γνώσις! Καὶ μὲν οἱ Ἕλληνες *ὀρθῶς Λόγον* τὸν Θεὸν εἶπον (ὅπερ οὐδ' ἐπὶ στιγμὴν εἶπον οἱ Ἀσιᾶται οὐδεμίαν ποτὲ σχόντες τοῦ Λόγου κατάγνωσιν, οὐτινος εὐθεῖα συνέπεια ἔστιν ὅτι ὁ Λόγος ὡς **Word** καὶ **Wort** καταφράζεται), ὅμως αὐτὸ οὐδ' ἐπὶ στιγμὴν πληροὶ τὴν ἀνάγκην τῆς καταγνώσεως τῆς Θείας Οὐσίας! Πρῶτος καὶ ἕκτοτε οὐσιαστικῶς μόνος ὁ Χριστὸς τὸν Θεὸν ὡσαύτως ὠνόμασε *κατὰ τὴν Οὐσίαν* Αὐτοῦ καὶ Ἀλήθειαν καὶ Ἀγάπην! *Πάντες* οἱ ἀρχαῖοι, μὴδὲ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐξαιρουμένων, οὐδεμίαν εἶχον κατάγνωσιν τῆς Ἀληθείας καὶ τῆς Ἀγάπης ὡς ἀναποσπάστων διακρίσεων τῆς Θείας Οὐσίας! Μέχρι τῆσδε ἡμέρας ἡ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησία οὐδόλως πως κατενόησε τὴν ἀληθῆ σημασίαν τούτων τῶν ὄρων: Ἀληθῶς λέγομεν τὸν Θεὸν Παντογνώστην! Ἀλλ' ἀκριβῶς ἐν αὐτῇ ταύτῃ τῇ Παντογνωσίᾳ Αὐτοῦ ὁ Θεὸς ὡσαύτως ἐγίνωσκειν ὅτι οὐ κατεῖχεν ἰδίαν προσωπικὴν ἐμπειρίαν τῆς πίεσεως ἥν ὡς ἄνθρωποι ἡμεῖς ἐπὶ γῆς ὑφίσταμεθα ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμῶν ἰδίας σαρκὸς ὑπὸ τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ ποιεῖν τὸ Αὐτοῦ Θέλημα παρὰ πάντα τὰ δεινὰ τάπὶ γῆς!

Ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἐν ταῖς φοβεραῖς ταῖσδε ἡμέραις παρατηροῦμεν τὰ παραδείγματα πίστεως εἰς Θεὸν ἃ διδάσκουσιν ἡμῖν οἱ παρ' ἡμῶν λεγόμενοι "φανατικοὶ" Μουσουλμᾶνοι αὐτανατινασσόμενοι ὑπὸ τὴν πίστιν τῆς καὶ οὐ-

τως ἐκπληρώσεως ἐντολῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ! Οὐ λέγω οὖσαν τὴν ἐντολήν! Οὖσαν λέγω τὴν *πίστιν*! Ὅμως, τιμίως ἀναλογισθῶμεν: Ἐν βραχεὶ λίαν κλάσματι δευτέρου τῆς ὥρας λεπτοῦ ὁ αὐτανατινασσόμενος αὐτόχειρ ἀπὸ τοῦ βίου ἀπέρχεται! Πιθανῶς, οὐδ' ὁ χρόνος ἐστὶν ἱκανὸς μεταδοῦναι τῇ συνειδήσει τοῦ πόνου τὴν αἴσθησιν! Εἰ ὄντως οὕτως, *ἀπόνοις* ὁ αὐτόχειρ ἀπέρχεται! Δοκοῦμεν τὴν πράξιν αὐτοκτονίαν ὁμοῦ τε καὶ ἔγκλημα; Δοκοῦμεν ἡμεῖς οἱ ἐκ μακρᾶς ἀποστάσεώς τε καὶ ἀσφαλείας ἀθώους ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς τῆς διαπράξεως τοῦ ἐνεγκεῖν τὸν αὐτόχειρα εἰς ἀπόγνωσιν; Ἄλλ' ἄρ' ἐσμέν ὄντως ἀθῶοι, ἢ μήπως καὶ *δολιχοδρομικῶς οἱ ἠθικοὶ κείνης τῆς πράξεως αὐτουργοί*; Διέκρινεν ἡμᾶς ὁ Χριστὸς εἰς ἀδελφοὺς τε καὶ μὴ ἀδελφούς, κατὰ γε τὸ περὶ Θεοῦ δόγμα, ἢ ἐκάλεσεν ἀδελφοὺς ἡμᾶς πάντας ἀδιακρίτως, ὡς ὄντας τέκνα τοῦ Ἐνὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς πάντας μόνου Πατρὸς καὶ Θεοῦ; Ἄρ' ἡ δολιχοδρομία μεταφορᾶς τῆς ἠθικῆς αὐτουργίας οὐδόλως συνίστησιν ἔρεισμα ἱκανὸν ἐκδόσεως παρὰ τοῦ Θείου Δικαστηρίου βουλεύματος ἄρσεως ἀφ' ἡμῶν τῆς περὶ τὴν πράξιν ἐκείνην εὐθύνης! **The globalization makes us all co-responsible! We no longer may hide behind our leaders! We voted them to power! And they on our behalf went to war, that resulted in unleashing the slaughter!** Τί οὖν ὡς Χριστιανοὶ λέγομεν; Ταῦτα μὲν ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ παρόντος παράδειγμα ὀφειλῆς περισκέψεως περὶ *πάντα* τὰ συντελούμενα, ἃ ὀπώπαμεν, ἃ προκαλοῦμεν, ἃ καθορώμεν, ἃ ὡς ἀνθρώπους δεῖ ἡμᾶς ἀναθρεῖν!

Ἄλλ' ἐπανέλθωμεν εἰς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ: Δικαστὴς καθ' ὅλα Δίκαιος ὢν ὁ Θεός, ἄρ' οὖν καὶ *γνώστης* τῆς ἀδυναμίας Αὐτοῦ ὡς Θεοῦ μὴ καταγιγνώσκειν τὴν καταπίεσιν ἐφ' ἧς οὐχ, ὡς Θεός, εἶχεν ἀνθρωπίνης ποנוύσης σαρκός, ὥφειλεν ἄρα τὸ μὲν ἀμφιβάλλειν περὶ τὸ μήπως ὑπὲρ τὰ παρ' ἡμῶν δυνατὰ ἐπέβαλεν ἡμῖν ἀπαιτήσεις, τὸ δὲ καταδείξει τοῖς πᾶσιν ὅτι παρὰ γε καὶ τοῦτο καθ' ὅλα Δίκαιος ἦν, ἔστι καὶ ἔσται! Οὐδ' ἦν *ἀν ποσὼς δίκαιον, ἄλλον, τὸν Υἱόν γε Αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ*, ἀποστεῖλαι κτᾶσθαι τὴν ἐμπειρίαν! Τίς γονεὺς ἀντὶ ἐαυτοῦ ἀποστέλλει τὸν μονογενῆ αὐτοῦ εἰς μαρτύριον; Πάντως, *οὐχί* τις ἀγαπῶν ὄντως! Ἄρα: *Πάντα* τὰ Ἰουδαϊκὰ περὶ Μεσσίου (στελλομένου μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, μὴ ὄντος ὅμως Αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ) βλασφήμου φαντασίας ἔστιν ἀποκυήματα· καὶ ἀκρίτως υἱοθετηθέντ' ὡς κάπο τῶν Χριστιανῶν *οὐκ* ἐστὶ σὺν Θεῷ! Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη, ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων δι' Ἰουδαίους κυρίως γραφείσα, συνέδεσέ πως τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ τῷ μύθῳ τῆς θυσίας τοῦ Ἰσαάκ, καὶ ταῖς προφητείαις καὶ ῥήσεσι περὶ τῆς ἀποκλειστικότητος τῆς τοῦ λαοῦ Ἰσραὴλ σχέσεως μετὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Κατὰ τοῦτο ἡ συνολικὴ τῆς Γραφῆς ἐρμηνεία ὀφείλει *προσεκτικῶς διαχωρίσαι* τὴν περὶ τῆς *Οὐσίας* τοῦ Θεοῦ δέουσαν εἶναι ὀρθὴν πάντων πίστιν ἀπὸ τῶν παραδόσεων ἐποχῶν *οὐδεμίαν σχοιῶν Λογικὴν* ἀντίληψιν τῆς Θείας Οὐσίας. Ἵνα σώσῃ *πάντας* ἀνθρώπους κατῆλθεν ὁ Κύριος ἐπὶ γῆς εἰς τὴν κατωτάτην βαθμίδα τῆς εἰς Οὐρανὸν ἄγουσαν κλίμακος, κάκειθεν καὶ εἰς τὸν Ἄδην ἵνα κενώσῃ καὶ τοῦ τὰ ταμεῖα! Ὅτι διὰ τοῦ λαοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἔως Ἀδου κατῆλθεν

οὐδέποθ' ὑπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ κείνου συνεχωρήθη Αὐτῷ, σιωπηρῶς οὕτω καταγγέλλαντι τὸ καταπεσεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὴν κατωτάτην βαθμίδα διὰ τὴν παρ' αὐτῶν πλήρη διαστροφήν τῆς τάνθρώπου μετὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ σχέσεως! Διὰ τοῦτο κατὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀνηλεῆς ἐκ μέρους αὐτῶν μαίνεται' ἐπὶ δισχιλιετίαν ὁ πόλεμος, ἀρνούμενων κατανοεῖν ὅτι οὕτω, κατὰ τοῦ Ὁλοῦ Ἀκεραίου, Ἀδιαρέτου Θεοῦ κενά βαλλουσιν! Ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὑπὸ τῶν ἀπὸ κείνων λαβόντων *τάμυδρά* "θεολογικά" φῶτα τοῦτο πλήρως κατενόηθη ὥστε μὴ γένηται πάντων κοινὴ κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ πράξις. Βεβαίως γέμει ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη δηλώσεων τοῦ Κυρίου ὡς Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ἀλλὰ πῶς ἀποδείκνυθ' ὅτι πᾶς αἱ ἀναφοραὶ αὐταὶ εἰσὶ περὶ μόνων τῶν σχέσεων *ἐντὸς* τῆς Ἀγίας Τριάδος, ἃς ἡμεῖς οἱ καλούμενοι "Χριστιανοὶ" *ἀφιλοσοφῆτως καὶ παραλόγως* ἐκλαμβάνομεν *ἐλαφρότατα, τουτέστιν ἄνευ τῆς καταγνώσεως τῆς συνόλου ἐσωτερικῆς λειτουργίας τοῦ ἐνὸς ἐν ἡμῖν πνεύματος*, ἥτοι κατὰ μόνα τὰ παρ' ἡμῖν παντελῶς ἐπιπόλαια, ὅτε ἡ ὅλη τοῦ Κυρίου προσπάθεια ἦν περὶ τὸ πείσαι ἀνθρώπους φέρεσθ' ὡς χρὴ πρὸς τὸν κοινὸν αὐτῶν πάντων Πατέρα Θεόν; Ὡς *ἄνθρωπος* τὸ μαρτύριον ὑπέστη ὁ Κύριος, ἀσφαλῶς καταμαρτυρούμενον ὑπὸ τῆς κραυγῆς "ἵνα τί ἐγκατέλιπές με;" Ὡς *ἄνθρωπος* ἔστη *ἐφ' ὅλον τρίωρον* ἐπὶ τοῦ Σταυροῦ, ἀντὶ τῆς μιᾶς *βραχίστης στιγμῆς* μόνης. Ὡς *ἄνθρωπος ἐφ' ὅλον τρίωρον ἐπὶ τοῦ Σταυροῦ ἐγκαταλειφθείς οὐκ ἀπέβαλε τὴν ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ πίστιν!* Ἰνα γε πεισθῇ ὡς Εἷς, Ἀδιαίρετος Δίκαιος Θεὸς Ὁλος ὅτι *οὐκ ἀδίκως, οὐ παρὰ Λόγον* ἐκζητεῖ ἀφ' ἡμῶν τὰ εἰσόδια εἰς Παράδεισον! Πλείον' ὅσων Αὐτὸς μόνος ὑπέστη, ἀφ' ἡμῶν *οὐ* ζητεῖ! Διὰ τοῦτ' ἄρα *δικαίως ὡς ὅλως Δίκαιος Θεὸς ἀναστὰς* ἐγκατεστάθη χῶς Κριτῆς τοῦ κόσμου παντὸς Δίκαιος *κρίνων ἀπὸ κείνης ἀκριβῶς τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς Ἀναστάσεως*, πλήρως οὕτω τηρῶν καὶ τὸ παρ' Αὐτοῦ πρὸ τῆς Σταυρώσεως πλειστάκις λεχθὲν "ἡγγικεν ἡ Θεοῦ βασιλεία", ἥς πέρι, οἱ δηλούμενοι "Χριστιανοί", ὅλως ἀμήχανοι, παντελῶς ἀδυνατοῦσιν ἐξηγήσαι τὴν βραδύτητα ἄλλως!

Φεῦ ἡμῖν μηδὲν τούτων ὑποφιαζομένοις, ἀγομένοις ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν Ἐκκλησίᾳ ταγῶν, οὐδὲν τούτων ἀντιλαμβανομένων, βατολογούντων, προσκολλημένων ἐπ' *Ἰουδαϊκὰ σφάλλοντα πρότυπα* σκέψεως, συγχρωτιζομένων δυνάσταις, καταδυναστευόντων ἐν κρυπτῷ τοὺς λαοὺς, οὐδὲ διὰ ψιθύρου τινὸς τολμώντων καταγγέλλειν, ὡς Κυρίου ἐκπρόσωποι, τοὺς παντελῶς ἀπνευματίστους δυνάστας τοῦ ὀρθοῦ Πνεύματος τῶν λαῶν, οὐδ' ὑπερασπίζεσθαι τὸ αἷμα ὃ διὰ βλασφήμους ἰδεοληψίας καπὶ ἀνομολογήτῳ κέρδους σκοπῷ καταχέεται!

Καί τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐτόλμησαν παραστῆν' ἐν τοῖς ἐγκαινίοις τοῦ νέου Μουσείου, καίτοι παντελῶς ξένοι τῇ ἐν τῷ Παρθενῶνι ποτέ, ἐν ἡμέραις κλέους, λατρευθείσῃ Ἀειπαρθένῳ Ἀθηνᾷ Θείᾳ Νοήσει-Σοφίᾳ, δοκήσαντες αὐτὰ ὡς ἔτι ἔν, καίτοι ἀσύνητες, κοσμικὸν-καλλιτεχνικὸν "γεγονός"! Ἐνῷ ἕτεροι καὶ *μᾶλλον* "σημαίνοντες" ἀπλῶς ἔλαμψαν διὰ τῆς κραυγαλέας αὐτῶν ἀπουσίας!

Μὴ καταπληττώμεθα: Οὐδείς πλέον τῶν γῆς "ἐπιφανῶν" ἐστὶ παντελῶς ἀθῶος καὶ ξένος τῶν κατὰ Θείαν Ἀνοχὴν ἔτι ἀπαραιτήτων συμβήσεσθαι, ἵν' ἐς ἀπόγειον φθάσῃ ἢ κατὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπαίσχυντος βλασφημία πρὸς πλήρη ἐξάντλησιν τῆς ἡμῖν δοθείσης ἐλευθερίας, πρὸ τοῦ τέλους τῆς Ἡμέρας τῆς Κρίσεως, τῆς ἀπὸ τῆς Ἡμέρας τῆς Ἀναστάσεως ἀρξαμένης! Φεῦ! Τὰ γλυπτὰ μάρμαρα εἰς οὐδεμίαν ἀπέβησαν περαιτέρω βελτίωσιν τῆς διὰ τῶν αἰώνων κατανοήσεως τῆς *μιας* πνευματικότητος τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τ' Ἀνθρώπου ὡς εἰκόνας Θεοῦ! Ἄλλως οὐκ ἂν ἦμεν ὅπου παγκοσμίως νῦν εὐρισκόμεθα, ἔτι πεισμόνως ἀρνούμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν γλυπτῶν μαρμάρων διδάσκεσθαι τὰ ὧντως πνευματικά!

Ἀθῆναι, 26 Ἰουνίου 2009.

GENERAL INDEX

ADDRESSEES:

Apostolides, R. H., 293
Artemiades, N., 479
Ash, E. A., 192
Bistis G., 416, 475, 515, 560, 566
Blackman, H. A., 90
Carey, J. Archbishop of Canterbury, 266
Christodoulos, Archbishop of Athens 377
Cowen, R., 144
Editor-in-Chief, Kathemerine, Athens, 250
Ferguson, K., 314
Gavalas, G. R., 81, 212
Giannaras, Ch., 288, 307
Giannoulatos, A., —Bishop, 153
(Specimen Letters to Gold, T., others)
Harper, C., 390
Harrison, E., 181, 208
Hawking, S., W., 205, 207
Hyde H., 412
Kantiotis, Aug. —Bishop, 169
Karkagiannes, A., Kathemerine, Athens ,278
Koch, H. W., 100, 104
Larson, D. D., 150
Manos, S., 509
Marinos, J., 257
Miller, T., U. S. Ambassador, 552
Newton, R., 93, 111
Nychis, P., 220, 233
Pauling, L. C., 27
Penzias, A., 20, 179
Pouncey, P. R., 97
President of Areios Pagos, 448
Press Release/Public Statement, 135
Romer, R. H., 89, 96
Samaras, A. 264
Samios, N. P., 146, 147
Sarres, N., 556
Skylakakes, Th., 372
T.E.E., Athens, 571, 573
Tennity, K., 24, 36, 45, 74

Themelis, N. J., 167
The Royal Society, 19
Treiman, S., 110
Wife, 196
Wigner, E. P., 86, 88
Witten, E., 234
Woolf, H., Inst. for Adv. Study, 110
Zoulas, S., 420
Zoumpoulakes, S., 437

ADDRESSEES' REPLIES

Ash A., E., 203
Ferguson, K., 371
Harper, C., 411
Harrison, E., 184, 209
Hohenberg, P. C., (for Penzias, A.) 185
Koch, H. W., 103
Larson, D. D., 152
Newton, R., 112
Nordstrom, D., 149
Pauling, L. C., 33, 43
Penzias, A., 23
Tennity, K., 36
Themelis, N. J., 167
The Royal Society, 22

AUTHOR'S RESPONSES TO ADDRESSEES' REPLIES

Harrison, E., 208, (Author's Comment, 209-11)
Hohenberg, P. C., 186
Koch, H. W., 104
Newton, R., 114
Pauling, L.C., 34, 69
Tennity, K., 45, 74
Themelis, N. J., 167
Wigner, E. P., 88

SUBJECTS

Action:

- a natural property of the oscillator comes in whole number multiples of h , 356
- is present in all physical phenomena, 356

Andersen, R. P., 100

Archimedes: his lesson not learned, 514

Artemiades, N., 479, 508

Ash, E., A.

- replies and the Author expresses some thoughts on where the *psychology* of relativity theory leads, 203-4

Besançon, R., 20, 69

Bethe, H., A., 83

Bismarck, O. E.L. von, 80

Black holes, 485

Blackmun, Harry, A. 90

Bohr, N., 484

Bohr and current theory:

- attacked for the identity of notions they use, 118, 119

Bohr model, 20, 29, 33, 37, 51, 61, 72, 75-6, 99, 107, 178, 180, 199, 206

Bronowski, J., 483

Bruno and Galileo 186

Carnot, N., L., S., 46

Cause: to bind *Reason and TheoLogy*

- an obligation of both sides, so far ignored, 13

Chandrasekhar, S. 83

Church:

- does nothing to prepare men for the Judgment 501
- never using the Intellect, *forgot* that God is Spirit, and thus that *only as Spirits* are we similar to Him, thus partaking of a *double* nature 495-6
- thus *confusing* the dogma, 496
- the correction is possible only by changing the fundamental belief:
 - the existence of God *can indeed be unquestionably proven*, as our present dilemma was foreseen by God, Who built in the world the resolution of it 498

Church:

Orthodox:

- broadcasted a totally pitiful picture 503
- current misdeeds at the top, 556-9

- does nothing other than attempting to return to her Byzantine past 502

Church and State relations:

- friendly to the Greek Supreme Court commentary, 448-74
 - on the Census and numbering of people, 449
 - on the said to be Christian resistance, 450
 - on the public confusion about file-keeping, 452
 - proposed understanding of the Revelation, regarding the “666” number, 455
 - on the Schengen Agreement, 457
 - on the new personal identification cards, 460
 - Needs of the Country for a secure future, 463
 - the present conflict between State and Church, 465
 - Identification details of the Person-Citizen, 466
 - possible wrongdoings due to revelation of personal data, 458
 - unfounded fears and intentional cover-up, 470
 - the Country’s loss due to the Church vs. State conflict, 472

Civilizations in the Globalized World:

- clash and reconciliation, 515
 - American responsibilities in the age of globalization, 528
 - America’s and the West’s only long-term-safe civilizational defensive attack, 535
 - “America vs. the World” is only the current title of an old game 516
 - beginning and end of the race to conquer the World, 517
 - call to terse yet confident, because faithful, action, 551
 - the confusion over the recent events, 548
 - the inspiring meaning, coming in from the future, of a defensible civilization, 541
 - the Near-and-Middle-Oriental civilizational pressure on the World in the age of globalization, 531
 - the sorry tale of grudges against America, 518
 - the stage of human events, 515

Clock synchronization:

- zero set— and rate—, 123

Correspondence:

- the present one only a selection revealing the general unwillingness of addressees to face the objective facts: many more did not respond in the least, 16

- Coulson, C. A., 39
 Cowen, R., 158
 Creation of the World:
 — choice between Chance or the Most Elegant Design 94
 — lack of courage to consider the choice, 94-5
 — the correct way of thinking about it, 367-8
 Critique of monastic life, 307-13
 Cronin, J., W., 83

 Dawkins, R.,
 — discussing his claims, 362 et seq.
 Design of the World and of the species:
 — proof of 368
 Detailed account of postgraduate studies, 81 et seq.
 Dilemma of choosing how science is to develop further, 93
 Dimensional analysis:
 — applied to Newton's law of gravitation, 15
 — what it revealed had never before been examined, and that was hated by both "scientists" and "theologians", because it led to Reason as the Ultimate Lawgiver, 16
 — ignored:
 — responses based on present-day knowledge, 23
 Dirac, P. A. M., 33, 35, 61, 116, 120, 190

 Eggers, Gregory, Halsey, Rabinovitch, 76
 Einstein, A., 30, 46, 50, 107, 114, 122 et seq., 178, 180, 190, 199, 205, 217, 484, 488
 — preferring psychology over Logic 204
 Einstein-deSitter, 31, 58-9, 73, 116
 Einstein's special relativity:
 examined in detail 125 et seq.
 — has *not* eliminated the need for absolute reference, 133
 — his insistence on the total equivalence of systems K and K' leads to that *each frame can regard itself alternately as stationary or moving*, 132-3
 — time dilatation experiments have conspicuously failed to consider *the real effects of motion on the ultimate internal constitution* of "clocks", 133
 Electrons in atoms:
 — arranged onion-like, 357
 — each has *one* quantum number, 357
 — questions of ionization resolved, 358
 — the spectral lines produced by the *entire ensemble* of electrons, 357
 — vibrate in tune, 357
 — visualization of each physical state preserved, 357
 Engineer asks himself:
 "If I could, how would I build the world?", 150
 Engineered structures:
 cannot result from relativity, indeterminacy and chance, 272
 Engineering:
 cannot build on the uncertainty principle, 118
 Epimenides:
 his paradox: the principle of the excluded contradiction, 483, 487
 Evolution: theory of, 360
 — discussion of, 360 et seq.
 Evolution vs. Creationism:
 from the root of the matter on up, 90 et seq.

 Ferguson, K.: *The Fire in the Equations*, 314
 Feyerabend, P. K., 487-8
 First law of thermodynamics:
 contrary to the law of Gravitation 106

 Giannoulatos, A., Bishop:
 — given a *full* analysis of the problem and a suggestion on how to act on the Church's behalf never responded, 153-55
 — given samples of letters to send off does nothing 166
 — re-addressed in the best possible despite the distance "presence" of eye-witnesses, again fails to act, 197-202
 Gibbs, J., W., 40
 God:
 — different conceptions of
 of the Greeks:
 Spirit, Logos, Living Person, 489
 of the Jews,
 harsh: expelled Adam and Eve,
 confused men's languages, 491
 of the Church:
 basically unknowable, 494
 never worshiped as *the* Logos. 489
 of Einstein:
 as the "field" itself, 489
 — effort of syncretistic co-existence of Good and Evil, 489
 — how He is found, 299
 — how the search for Him is posed, 296
 — on His existence, 293
 — the source of the Laws of Nature, 304
 — the origins of Gods believed, 294
 — the scientific means of finding Him, 301
 — the reception of the news, 304
 — who pose the problem 293
 — posed by men, 294

- posed by the state of things. 294
- posed by the world, 296
- Gödel, K., 35, 484 et seq., 487-8, 507-8
- Greece:
 - what is needed to be done in, 372-6
- Greek ancient sculpture:
 - the continuing barbaric treatment of it, 575-83
- Greek flag: what it symbolizes, 504
- Greeks and Jews in the World, 416-9
- Harrison, E.:
 - Re: "Darkness at Night", 181-84
- Hawking, S. W.:
 - "the theory of everything", 488
 - received letter, book, details of treatment by scientists, but never replied 205-7, 218,
- Heisenberg, W., 32, 37, 40, 51, 70, 117, 484
- Helmholtz, von, H., L., F., 40
- History:
 - looked at spiritually, 422-36
- History and Beliefs:
 - short critical evaluation of, on the closing of the bimillennium, 438-47
- Hohenberg, P. C., 202, 207
 - replies on behalf of A. Penzias and receives the Author's reply, 185-91
- Homer: paraphrasing him, 369
- Hubble, E. P., 367
- Hutchinson, C., 85
- Integral and differential philosophy on what must be done about the environment and continual well being, 571-2
- Isocrates: on who is Greek, 505
- Kantiotis, Aug., Bishop
 - given a full analysis of the state of things as they today apply to and interrelate theology and science never replied, 169-78
- Koch, H., W.,
 - informed of improper actions of his subordinates, 100-2
 - endorses them, 103
 - receives a *detailed* explanation of what is attempted to be kept hidden but fails totally to respond, 104-9
- Lamentation of a Returnee to Greece, 257-63
- Larson, D., D.:
 - given details, replied that he contended with the same problem, but gave no details and offered no assistance, 150-2
- Law, Lawgiver, Nous, Logos, 490
- Law of Gravitation:
 - dimensional analysis of and consequences, 20
 - incomplete without consideration of the Law of Separation determining the true distance between bodies, 95
- Licentiousness of Leaders
 - and how it is to be lifted, 255-6
- Life and Living, and their Meaning, 288-92
- Lindley, D.: *The End of Physics*, 314
- Logos and Executing Agent:
 - their collaboration *cannot but be absolute as is necessary*, 480-1
- Lorentz, H., A., 118, 120
- Mach Principle, 31, 106
- Man and *his* beliefs:
 - does *not* consider them unorthodox, 422
- Manos, S.:
 - exposing his faulty arguments regarding capital formation 512
 - given examples of what the Greek State ought to have done but has not 514
- Masoretic recension, 229
- Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity, 366
- Michelson-Morley experiment, 69, 98, 106, 117, 120-1, 151, 180, 199, 216, 484
- Mineral Industry in the USA:
 - state of research in it and the stock market, 167
- Minkowski, H., 98, 107
- Most Elegant Design, 99, 105
- Nemesis, Crime, and Challenge, 406-10
- Newton, I., 22, 57, 62
- Newton's Law of gravitation, 15, 30 et seq., 47, 69, 73, 98, 106, 115, 150, 205-6, 210, 366-7
 - and universal expansion, 124
 - its universal significance had been missed 272
 - the immediate results of its analysis, 151
- Newton's "Principia" 300th anniversary gone unnoticed, 22
- Newton, R.:
 - receives letters, 93, 111
 - replies, 112
 - receives a full reply to all his reserved remarks but fails to counter them, 114-21
- Ollom, J., 74-9
- Orthodoxy and Civilization, 280-7
- Pauli Exclusion Principle, 37, 51
- Pauling, L.: 74-8, 83
 - receives a detailed request for review, gets interested, receives manuscript studies it

- and responds, 27-33, 43-44
 - Author's response details what Pauling "missed", 69-73
- Penzias, A., 21, 179, 186, 188-9, 202, 207
- Pessimism and Objective Reality, 475-8
- Phillips, J., B., 39
- Photoelectric emission, 119
- Physics Today:
 - their unwillingness to respond in any way to the application of review, 97
- Planck, M., 50, 72, 75, 209-10, 484
- Planck-Einstein equation, 107
- Plea for action by Archbishop, 377-89
- Pouncey, P., R.,
 - receives details of Dr. Romer's actions and a description of what is attempted to be kept hidden, 97-99
- Plato, 224
- Plato and the modern era:
 - the gap between them, 13
- Plato's ideal:
 - ultimately, *all* do make Sense, 15
- Present-day duties of Christians, 266-77
- Presidential Indiscretions and their consequences, 412-5
- Press Release/Public Statement:
 - details of findings given briefly, 138-43
 - is not responded to 135-43
 - societies referred to, their publications and the people responding on their behalf given by name. 135-6
- Public correspondence and its quality. 278-9
- Quantum mechanics:
 - problems of current theory, 344-60
 - how they are resolved based on the Principle of Mathematical and Logical Consistency and Simplicity, 354
 - amount of action *not assumed but proven* to come in whole number multiples of the least action h , 356
 - Balmer and Rydberg laws reproduced, 356
 - wave number reproduced, 356
- Questions:
 - on the Quality of Submissions, 65
 - the more difficult the better: the mother's milk of research, and the answers to them 192-6
- Reader:
 - will assess correctly the Situation only if objective, intellectually disciplined, and sufficiently brave, 16
- Reason:
 - leads to Λόγος, that dwells in a Person, 16
- "Reason":
 - the sort that "scientists" obey and serve, 15
 - so, they cannot but return to the belief that all is for nought, 15
- Reasoned TheoLogY:
 - obligatory principles of, 397-401
- Relativity of Clocks:
 - an article examining the full details of the problem is submitted, 122-34
 - but rejected as "unsuitable" without disproof 149
- Religious leaders:
 - "lead" people, but *not* con Deo, 145
- Romer, R., H., 100
 - decides not to review the book, 95
 - Author's answer to him, 96
 - protesting against his action, 97
 - returns a book offered gratis and deprives Amherst College of the opportunity to enrich its library 98
- Russell, B. 188, 204, 217
 - and the category having just one member, 16
- Rutherford, Sir E., 118, 206
- Rydberg, J., R., 76, 151, 206
- Samios, N., P., 158
 - fails to respond to two letters, 146-8
- Schrödinger, E., 76, 484
- Science:
 - development of, wrong during the last eighty years 93
 - its present state, 560-5
 - a second look at it, 566-70
- Science and Faith: by way of Truth, 314
 - consequences of disciplined thinking, 329 et seq.
 - on the problem of the Michelson-Morley experiment, 335-6
 - on the problem of Newton's Law, 336-7
 - on the problem of the separation of bodies, 337-9
 - on the problems of light and energy, 330-3
 - their solution, 333-5
 - on the true significance of Newton's Law, 339-44
 - Personal God:
 - how considering Him simplifies matters, 325-9
 - present impasse and peril, 315-6
 - present theories
 - their origin, ground and purpose are

- suspicious, 317-22
- Religion and Science:
 - the bone of contention, 322-5
- Science and TheoLogY:
 - have indeed been bridged, 17
 - the obstructionists *must* prepare their personal ApoLogY, 17
- Science and Orthodoxy, 479
- Science and Religion:
 - fundamental problems of rapprochement, 390
 - beginning and cause of separation, 390-1
 - “Believers’” failure of Faith in God, 391-3
 - Non-believers’ failure of Faith in Reason, 394-7
- Science is Γνωσις leading to Wisdom, 15
- Science, modern:
 - critique and reasoned refounding of, 401-6
- “Scientific” statements :
 - have been made on *very inadequate* understanding of the *hard* issues present in natural Law, 272
- “Scientists”:
 - split between two beliefs:
 - that *acausally*, the world has always been and that it came into being at the “Big Bang”, 14
 - both in conflict with our demand to seek causes, 14
 - their plans for the future, 15
 - they believe the world has on reason for being, 14
 - — yet, they want us to believe they serve Reason!, 14
 - they do *not* explain how an unreasoning universe through us demands Reason, 14
 - they do *not* explain how an unreasoning and indeterminate universe brought about determinacy, 14
- Searching for competent and courageous reviewers, 82 et seq.
- Segal., I. E., 23
- Socrates: 197
 - Appealing his Trial, 242-9
- Socrates and Plato 216
- Socrates’ and Plato’s fates:
 - ought to tell what is coming to far seeing people, 15-6
- “Somehow”:
 - the method “science” and “theology” think the world came into being, 13
- Sophistry and Philosophy:
 - their distinction abandoned willingly, 422
- Special relativity:
 - mixed up the positions at the light front and of the origin of K’ as seen from K, 217-8
- State of Democracy and the Citizen’s Responsibility, 250-4
- State of Skoplje:
 - the problem of its name 264-5
- State of the world and who’s responsible, 218-9
- Stefan-Boltzmann law, 181
- Stephenson, G., 46
- Stone, I. F., 186
- Tarski, A., 484 et seq., 508
- Tennity, K.: 85
 - receives the detailed history of development of the new ideas, 24 et seq.
 - and responds with reviews received, 36 et seq.
 - reviews: their inadequacy completely rebutted and exposed, 45 et seq.
 - receives the full details of the Author’s long discussion of the book with Prof. J. Ollom, 74-80
- Terzian, Y., 83
- The global problem of energy temperature, 573-4
- “Theologians”:
 - do *not* see it as their obligation to investigate *how* God created the world, 13
 - profane God by stating that His existence cannot be proven, 13-4
 - if His existence cannot be proven, neither can His Will, 14
- TheoLogY:
 - presenting it in the present light to an old-fashioned theologian, 220-32
 - who refuses to respond 232-3
- Theology and the World:
 - presented to a practicing Jew, who fails to respond, 234-241
- Theories:
 - the detailed evaluated for truth list of their hypotheses is never attached, 486-7
- Theory and experiment:
 - the adequacy of their founding hypotheses never examined, 486
 - a “theory of everything” thus becomes ever more uncertain, 486
- “Theory of everything”:
 - a cunning substitute for God, 486
 - already foreclosed by Gödel, 499
- Theory of relativity::
 - built on faulty analysis, 98
- Treiman, S., 158, 178,
 - receives request for competent disproof, but fails to respond, 110

Uncertainty measure h = unit of action:
 an article of mystic faith, 119
Understanding:
 — by well-developed reasoning,
 not by feeling or sentiment, 422
Universe:
 — its logicality being complete permits
 studying the Law, 20
Universe, Creation, Creator:
 — discussion of the problems posed by, 211-7
Velocity of Light:
 — Law of Variation of, and its consequences,
 20

Weinberg, S.:
 — attempts to pass as “science” what *cannot*
 be science, 210
Weyl, H., 106
Wigner, E. P., 110
Wilson, R., W., 21, 83
Woolf, H., 158, 178
 — receives request for competent disproof,
 acknowledges receipt, forwards book to
 the “proper” department but ever since
 totally fails to respond, 110
World state:
 its present mess:
 — the result of the “theologians” teaching, 14
X-ray spectra experience, 119

+

+

OBSCURANTISM SELECTED MOSTLY EXPOSED UNANSWERED EARLIER CORRESPONDENCE

BY: GEORGE P. STAVROPOULOS

Having finished writing the seven first books of this series, a prolonged effort begun back in 1974 with my realization that, (a) subjecting Newton's Law of Gravitation to dimensional analysis inevitably led to *rock-solid conclusions standing securely at complete variance* with the theories of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries that still constitute the foundation even of our present understanding of the structure of matter and of the entire material universe; (b) having devoted the years from 1974 to 1985 to completing the examination of the inevitable step-by-ever-careful-step progress of thought following that analysis; (c) writing the PRINCIPIA PHYSICA UNIVERSI; (d) having made truly strenuous efforts to find a publisher willing to undertake the publication of that book that led nowhere on account of disbelief, unwillingness, estimation of the market, and *quite probably clear threats* from the academic community against any publisher who would undertake to help dethrone the still standing theories and expose their supporters and peddlers; (e) having exhausted my savings in publishing the book myself; and (f) having sent the book to quite a number of the most prestigious universities and institutions in the USA and abroad, including even the Princeton University and the Institute for Advanced Study, and having never received an acknowledgement of receipt especially from the latter, let quite alone a rebuttal, I eventually gave up along that line of effort, and devoted my time to deepening my understanding of what it means that the entire universe, from the "ground" on up, *is unquestionably built on Reason*, part of which is arithmetic, geometry, structure, Law, Purpose! It simply *cannot* be a coincidence of the most pure unadulterated chance that from the original dimensional analysis one *is inexorably led to determining* the size and mass of the universe, the Law of its expansion, even the mass and the number of the Democritean atoms extant! It is unbecoming of professors and Nobel laureates to speak of "chance" as ostensibly being the root of things: The "chance" one speaks of as regards the throw of dice is built on the *strictest law of their construction*! Before *any self-respecting* demiurge presents *any one* of his constructions, he has done a *very serious though unseen effort* to meet a *specific* purpose and has put together the means needed. A "demiurge" is *by definition* any one who presents his construction to *public* scrutiny. And the more self-respecting, all the more does he try to present his work *absolutely perfect*. The material universe in which we live *is a construction* revealed as such by the laws it obeys, that *are* the product of Reason, the power to institute those laws, and the power to bring into being the atoms on which those laws operate. The universe *lacks completely all these means*! It also has had a definite beginning, since the Laws it obeys contain its age, that, *ipso facto*, *cannot* be infinite! In *simple honest words*, the universe *is* the proof of its own *reasoning and purposeful* Demiurge! *This is the One* Whose presence the "establishment" has desperately attempted to keep from the public consciousness!

This book contains only a collection from my correspondence sent to and the replies I received (mostly, *I did not receive any!*) from some of the top scientists, and theologians I thought would feel honor-bound to provide a meaningful reply to the problem thus facing us all straight in the eyes, which *all these people*, teachers and spiritual leaders of the world, provide the proof of their *willful* averting of the eyes from the Eyes that face us all! I wish I would not have to expose them! Duty, Truth, the souls everywhere living in the agony of knowing and demanding to know command otherwise! *I cannot* refuse to keep this material from them!

ISBN: 978-960-85044-7-9

Τιμή: (?).

+

+